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Abstract

"LANDSCAPES SUBLIME: IMPERIALISM, THE WILDERNESS IDEAL AND THE HISTORY OF CONSERVATION IN TANZANIA"

The aim of this dissertation is to trace the implications that Western views of nature have had for the restructuring of African landscapes through the creation of game reserves and national parks, with a particular focus on Tanzania. I contend that wilderness spaces are the main repositories of a western imaginary that longs for those places where nature is prodigious and untamed, uncontaminated by development and devoid of people. The idealization of landscapes is derived from the aesthetic of the Romantic sublime with its dual impulse: the quest for escape from a fragmenting and morally corrupting capitalist society, and the search for the immutable and the transcendent in landscape 'untouched' by development. In Africa the physical manifestation of the wilderness landscape ideal came to be reflected in real space – the space of the East African national park. To produce a wild landscape in which animals roam free required the reproduction of a certain ideology of nature which may have been inaugurated during the colonial period, but which has been assimilated and even expanded by post-colonial regimes like Tanzania. Why is it, I ask, that the wilderness landscape ideal is so remarkably persistent in the post-colonial, post-socialist Tanzania of today? Taking the approach of scholars like Mitchell, I ask not just what landscape ‘is or ‘means' but what it does in this context.
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PROLOGUE: Landscapes of Longing: Journeys through Memory and Place

My subject, the ideal of wilderness in Africa, is wide ranging, and draws on a variety of sources. What has intrigued me is the question of where the romantic idea of the African wilds originated, but also what its implications have been in real terms - in the way, for instance, that the structuring of land in the colonies have determined the possibilities for thinking spatial relations. I am interested in the ideal of wilderness as an aesthetic, but also as an idea that deeply engages the cultural, sociopolitical and environmental discourses that intersect with the politics of land use.

What led me to investigate the wilderness ideal in East Africa was a series of landscape and wild life oil paintings by my grandmother, Violet Butler. Many of her paintings had been dispersed in private collections but those most valued by her remained in the collection of our family. These paintings were an intimate part of my life and the visual repertoire of my everyday experience of home. The landscapes of the Great Rift Valley filled the walls and the imagination since my earliest recollection: Mto-Wa-Mbu (River of Mosquitos), Dawn on the Great Rift, Lesser Flamingos (Lake Natron), Soda Volcano ‘Ol Doinyo Lengai’, Black Rhino (Lake Manyara), Elephants (Uaso Nyiro River, Northern Frontier), and others. These scenes were the promise of ‘elsewhere’ within the confines of the Johannesburg suburbia of my youth; a white middle class home within the ‘white settler’ colony of South Africa in the 1970’s and 1980s. When I looked at these paintings, notions of ‘home’, the closed and interior space of the familiar, the family, became conflated with ‘away’, the unfamiliar, exotic landscape of another Africa, an Africa other than South Africa.

Painted representations of the African wilds were invested with a family mythology that was largely unspoken. They simply were, in and of themselves, the wilderness places in East Africa to which my grandmother, Violet Butler, and my father, Peter Butler, had traveled in search of ‘Big Game’. Each painting occupied a site of encounter that was opaque to me. I knew these paintings to be suffused with presence, filling the mind instantaneously with experiences long past and of places far away. To them the paintings were a memento of travel, a moment in a journey given to reflection. The pictorial language of naturalism within the paintings reflected those moments back at us as they hung on the walls of our home. To those who had been there, they offered the possibility of the recuperation of experience through memory. But to those who were not there, and to me especially, they were the site of a double loss: the experience to which the paintings referred were utterly irretrievable, and with the failure of metonymic memory, the original referents in the paintings were irrecoverably lost.

I was not there. When I look at these paintings I know that the moments that they represent can only be abstractly recuperated. I understand these images not with living, immediate recall, but with a kind of
amnesiac response. The paintings may still be accessible in line and colour, but with time their link to lived experience falters and fades.

Violet Butler painted the landscape scenes that she encountered in the north-eastern sector of what was then known as Tanganyikan Territory, an area that she and her son Peter came to know well during their travels over eighteen years. Driven by what could be called a backward-looking romanticism, they encountered what may be called the *kulturlandschaft* (the indigenous and colonial cultural landscapes of settlement, history and artifact), or the *naturlandschaft* (the natural landscape, including agglomerations of agriculture and industry within the natural environs). But in essence, they were in search of an *urlandschaft* or primal landscape of pristine wilderness (Atkins: 1998: xvii). In Violet and Peter Butler’s travel in search of wilderness spaces they imagined to be devoid of human habitation, culture and history we find a distinct manifestation of a type of ‘primitivist desire’. I take my use of this term from Torgovnick (1988), who argues that primitivism is not a narrowly defined concept specifically related to western ideas about indigenous groups, but should be understood as a broader term that encapsulates thinking about origins and pure states:

> Properly speaking, primitivism refers not just to an interest in or borrowing from indigenous groups – though that is how the term is commonly used today. In fact, this is an important, but relatively late meaning, and one that should be informed by the recognition that, contrary to the practice of many primitivists, ‘primitive peoples’ are diverse in terms of their social systems and beliefs and typically exist today in contact with the modern world. *Primitivism inhabits thinking about origins and pure states; it informs desires for unknown beginnings and, by extension, for predictable ends.* Primitivism is the utopian desire to go back and recover the irreducible features of the psyche, body, land and community – to reinhabit core experiences (Torgovnick 1998: 5). (my emphasis).

In Violet and Peter’s travels we find a primitivism that is the utopian desire to ‘go back’, to return to wild nature as an ‘original’ state of being. They traveled in search of ‘primordial’ landscapes of untouched wilderness in which they could be immersed, and which would allow them to temporarily leave behind society, culture or historical moment of which they were part and imagine themselves to be one with the natural world. In their travels they were able to “reinhabit core experiences”; they experienced the earth in a way that eluded most people of 1940s and 1950s. They discovered exotic flora and strange insects, caught the wild fauna on camera, were directly exposed to capricious weather changes, and struggled though times of water scarcity where they would of need gather dew or dig in dry river beds. They drove on all types of earth from volcanic dust to black cotton soil on roads good, bad and awful, climbing or descending with the shifting topography of the landscape. They encountered a variety of climates and variations of altitude, slept in the open under an arc of stars, and kept note of the cycles of the moon.

When away from East Africa they longed to return to their self-professed ‘spiritual home in the wilds’. It was a ‘home’, it seemed, that could be found wherever pristine wilderness and an abundance of wild life
existed. Suffice to say that Peter and Violet Butler’s travels to British East Africa between 1944 and 1963 can be seen as having been influenced by the appreciation of wild scenes, and these experiences became reproduced in film, photographs and paintings. They called their mode of travel ‘safari’ after a Swahili word (derived from the Arabic) that referred to a sporting expedition when from the nineteenth-century onwards Europeans began to hunt extensively in areas of East Africa (Bull 1992: 17 - 18). Safari is a word that had become decisively associated with this eastern region of Africa, with European hunting expeditions and with native labour. They may have been ‘on safari’ but their style of travel was different from the epic imaginatively conjured up by the word. They would live off tinned food and temerity, never lighting fires so as not to scare away the animals, never shooting for the pot except for an occasional unfortunate francolin, straining drinking water from the rivulets of the Rift through a chiffon scarf. Their style of safari was reclusive and unassisted, a sporting expedition only in the sense of their objective: to hunt big game with a camera.

They adopted a mode of travel that was very modest in comparison to the conventional safari with its mounds of equipment and the scores of men that would make up the ‘hunting party’. Instead, it was just the two of them, an unusual arrangement by all accounts, as Peter explained in an unpublished autobiographical text:

Our method of safari is, I think, almost unique in that we do not take native servants or trackers or hire a white hunter, but go by ourselves, just the two of us. We do not light camp fires, or lamps, so that we do as little as possible to startle the game away from our camp (Peter Butler On Safari : 1).

What is remarkable about his description of camping in the wilds is the deference that they paid to the game surrounding them. It is clear that what they sought first and foremost was intimate contact with the animals in the vicinity of their camps. This was achieved through various means: by travelling in isolation which meant that they could move into areas without too much disturbance to the natural inhabitants and remain there more quietly, and by avoiding those things that were almost mandatory on the conventional safari like camp fires and lamps. When camping wild they preferred to succumb to the diurnal rhythm of their natural surrounds, and would customarily retire at the onset of dark to be up at the first call of the dawn chorus:

We like to wake up in the grey of morning and look out of the window with every likelihood of seeing the dim mysterious shape of a buffalo or a rhino in the half-light, and tumble out with gun and camera to follow it until the light is good enough to film. We all do our cooking on a primus stove and don’t light a camp fire at all. Our diet is somewhat limited, because ‘hunting’ does not allow us much time for cooking. However we keep our weight down this way and just as well, on those occasions when our ‘subject’ becomes enraged and chases us up a tree! (Peter Butler Big Game: 1).
It would take two weeks and 2600 miles to reach the big game country of Northern Tanganyika where they could find the wild buffalo, lion and black rhino which they had traveled so far to film. Not only did they travel this distance to inhabit the isolation of wilderness, but in their desire to recover the an experience of wild land and animals they searched out the most remote places that they could find in the hope of finding fugitive game. Wild animals were growing increasingly scarce as the years wore on:

Every safari is a little more difficult than the last; we have to go a little farther out 'into the blue' to find big game to film; deeper into forests to find out their retreats (Peter Butler Tanganyika: 5).

And so they quickly developed a particular bent for side roads, such as they are in Africa, could be “anything from a cow track to a rock garden”. They occasionally got “buried up to the floorboards in either sand or mud half a dozen times within a single mile” (ibid). It was tough going, especially since much of their travel was accomplished at a time when there were no commercially available four-wheel drive vehicles. The first of a new generation of utility vehicles had been manufactured by Ford and Willys-Overland between 1941 and 1945 and were intended exclusively for service in the Second World War. But it was only many years later that Peter and Violet would acquire a Jeep, and later on a Land Rover. In the meantime they had had to devise their own means by which they could go big game ‘hunting’.

In an unpublished article narrating the events leading up to their first trip, Peter describes how, in the early 1940s, they conceived a plan whereby they could realise their dream of self-drive safari to far-flung places in East Africa.

Our plan was this: we would buy a large second-hand limousine car and build a caravan on the chassis after discarding the existing body. Our first problem was to find a car large enough to build a comfortable sized caravan on and strong enough to take the strain of traveling over thousands of miles of Africa’s terrible roads or even over the veld. Finally we found such a car, a veritable giant which seemed just made for us (Peter Butler First Safari: 1).

It was an American-built 1937 Packard, most likely the Packard Twelve Limousine (Model 1508-1035) with a 144" wheelbase that had originally been designed to allow for no less than seven passengers to tour in comfort. Peter had commissioned extensive alterations and fitments to the vehicle, but in spite of the careful plans they had submitted, they were not satisfied with the result. No sooner had Peter got the vehicle home than he pulled the best part of it down and promptly rebuilt it to their own design. They fitted out the interior themselves, dividing it into three partitions: a sleeping area in the front, sitting room, and kitchenette and bath-shower at the back. It even had a verandah.

The rear wall was cut in half horizontally across the middle so that the lower part could be let down on two wire ropes to make a verandah and the upper half could be pushed upwards to form a shelter to it. The walls were double to insulate us from the heat and cold. When it was fully loaded with our belongings it weighed about three and a half tons. But in spite of this we could climb a hill at a rate many a car owner might have envied (Peter Butler First Safari: 1).
And so 'Tambo' was born, who before too long would become thoroughly acquainted with the great outdoors. Tambo was a Swahili term that conferred various meanings in that language among them “distance”, “enigma”, “stature”, “strength”, “swaggering”, “bearing”, “vigor”, “width”, “prancing or rearing”, “length” (as translated by the Yale University Program in African Languages). This seems quite apt as a description both of the caravan’s bearing and of the bestial power of the V-12, 8 cylinder engine which was to take them thousands of miles, but suggests also the swaggering and prancing spectacle that the vehicle might have presented to the local inhabitants as it made its way over the irregular dirt tracks. Painted a shade of racing green below, pale tone above, and with chrome-trim headlamps blinking in the tropical sun, it was the premier luxury automobile of the inter-war era at large in Africa.

Without any assets besides the ’37 Packard that was their home, and without work besides the possibility of the sales of paintings, photographs and cine-films, they led an unconventional existence, returning periodically to Johannesburg to attend to the necessities of modern life: trips to town, letters and articles to write, the endless quest for funding, the need for repair and restock. When away from the wilds they languished, complaining of losing strength in the miserable and disheartening conditions of Johannesburg. In this prolonged pause they became the restive inhabitants of camping grounds and hotel gardens, unruly members of the rank and file, unsettled white settlers in South Africa. Here they were equivocal British expatriates in a land awash in apartheid-era Afrikaner nationalism.

Their itinerant way of life, and their unusual relationship as a mother and son team, placed them decidedly on the periphery of mainstream society of the era. Violet, however, had excellent societal credentials because had been well known as a miniature painter of royal and society figures in Britain and had exhibited at the Royal Academy in London and the Salon in Paris in the 1920's and '30's. Notable among her royal portraits were King George V, Queen Marie of Rumania, the Duke and Duchess of Portland and the Duke of Connaught. With this attainment in hand, she was well placed socially, and able to secure commissions to paint miniature and other portraits the sales of which would fund the next journey North.

---

1 Violet had become well known in London in the late 1920's and 1930’s as a painter of miniatures of exquisite detail. Her miniatures had been exhibited at various galleries: The Royal Academy of Arts in London, the Medici Galleries in Bond Street, the Walker Art Gallery in Liverpool (national gallery of the North of England), and the Paris Salon (an exhibition of the Académie des beaux-arts in Paris).
It was the political independence of the East African colonies that harkened the end of their travels, for it was then that they came to regard these regions as being inaccessible for political reasons (this in spite of the fact that they had continued to travel extensively throughout the Mau-Mau rebellion). So when Tanzania, Uganda and Kenya became independent nation-states Violet Butler began to paint landscapes of the Great Rift Valley in oils. From 1963 onwards she began documenting their travels, working from a collection of photographic slides that were cast onto the wall of her room through the lens of a projector. Here the images from past journeys could spread and stretch before her like a motion picture caught for hours on end on a single frame. Between the cast of memory and diffuse light of projection a process of transference took place, the result of which became the painted representation. On the level of perception and consciousness the shallow illusion on the wall was transposed through her perceiving retina and responsive hand into compositional coherency on canvas. But on the level of the unconscious, the projected image mirrored a corresponding introjection or memory-picture that was conflated with and inseparable from its object, the artwork. Each landscape painting was the physical trace of the past brought into materiality as oil paint on canvas. They were image-pictures of the mind distilled from the myriad moments of travel to well-loved places in East Africa: Esimingor, Natron, Lengai, Meru, Kateti, Mto-Wa-Mbu, Amboseli, Kerimasi, Manyara. Impressions of place - fragmentary, trivial, fantastic, evanescent were captured in each line and daub of the brush as if layering the lived sensations of their many journeys on canvas.

These paintings – the style, composition, a pleasing combination of shapes that comprise a scene – were produced from within a tradition of an aesthetic appreciation of wild landscapes. However, my intention is not to excavate the historical context and autobiographical circumstances out of which these painted artifacts emerge, but rather to address the more abstract question of the how wilderness in East Africa came to be idealized. The conception of wild space as aesthetically pleasing and ontologically charged is, I believe, derived from the Western Romantic tradition. I explore how the Romantic idea of wilderness, derived from long history of affect upon the European and American imagination, as having had immense implications for the restructuring of African landscapes during the colonial period. However, it is an ideology of nature that is not only confined to the colonial period, but continues to have a deep impact upon nature-rich countries in post-colonial Africa such as Tanzania, as I discuss in later chapters.

Any mention of wild spaces of twentieth-century Africa must, I think, include a discussion of the phenomenon of wilderness preservation in the form of national parks and reserves. Such a discussion cannot be confined to the aesthetic idealization of wilderness landscape alone, but must focus also upon legal, economic and material conditions that necessitated the creation of reserves in the first place. In the chapters that follow I look at the national park as a very particular cultural production premised upon the ideal of the wild landscape. But where did the idealization of wild nature originate and how did come to be transposed (or imposed, as Neumann (1998) would have it) upon the African continent of the colonial period? Why is it that wild animals and wild landscapes in Africa are so idealized and, as a consequence, so highly valued?

In investigating these questions I have turned to scholars like Mitchell (1994) and Cosgrove (1984), both of whom have acknowledged landscape to be an exhausted medium in the twentieth-century. These authors have been very influential in this dissertation, and I discuss their specific assertions in some detail in the first chapter, ‘The Represented Landscape’. In this section I provide a wide-ranging discussion about the ways in which wilderness landscapes are imagined in Europe and America and the art-historical precedents out of which the modern appreciation of wild nature has sprung. I then go on in the next chapter, ‘Territories of Production, Reproduction and Imagination’, to look at the ways in which the wilderness landscape ideal has been transposed onto Africa as a particular vision associated with the ethos of capitalist imperialism. 

Cosgrove is particularly useful because he gives a neo-Marxist historiography of landscape in which he ascribes the end of the landscape tradition that had been so pervasive in previous centuries to the rise of industrial capitalism and the changing capitalist landscapes of modernity. According to him, the demise of

---

2 Because the idea of Africa has had a long history of being conceived of as ‘other’, European genres of aesthetics such as the sublime cannot be applied in as straightforward a manner as perhaps could be the case in a discussion of European landscapes. After all, landscape in its ‘pure’ form is a western European phenomenon (Mitchell 1994: 7). In spite of acknowledging this difficulty, European-derived genres have been exceedingly helpful in my investigations.
landscape is roughly coterminous with Ruskin’s disillusionment and death in 1900, whose late writings describe the moral deterioration of capitalist society figured through the visual and literal pollution of the landscape of late Victorian England. Cosgrove does, however, argue that the landscape idea persists into the twentieth century, and is especially evident in those places in England that have been preserved from the onslaughts of capitalism. In other words, he sees the landscape idea persisting in those places where nature is seen to be uncontaminated by commercial development. By following a similar line of argument I contend that wilderness spaces of East Africa are one of the main repositories of a western imaginary that longs for those places where nature is prodigious and untamed, uncontaminated by development and devoid of people. And it is particularly the national park or reserve that has today become the locus of this landscape ideal.

While national parks function to preserve the landscape from the destruction of natural habitat through environmental changes associated with development, and to preserve the plants and animals that occur there, they are also preserves of another kind. National parks are the preserves of scenic values (Cosgrove 1984: 264). ‘Wild’ landscapes allow visitors to view and experience the landscape in ways reminiscent of previous tradition of aesthetics, a tradition that found pre-eminence in the romantic regard of wild nature of the previous century. The protection of natural habitat and the endemic or rare plants and animals that occur there are often accompanied by a set of largely unarticulated aesthetic values that have long been associated with wilderness spaces. This is why the landscape idea is most frequently to be found where there is land in its ‘natural’ or wild state, and it is for this reason that Cosgrove asserts that the national parks of England are the preserves of scenic values. In doing so he implies that accompanying the preservation of the unhumanised landscape is the preservation also of an older tradition of viewing.

Wilderness in the form of national parks and reserves are frequently seen as providing a respite and escape from the forces of human activity and global capitalism, but, ironically, these are the very forces that have been at work in the producing these spaces in the first place. Wild landscapes, seemingly devoid of human intervention, are often seen as outside of society. The apparent ‘naturalness’ of these areas tend to allow land to become disassociate from its social and human aspects, and become imaginatively invested as an ‘other’ space. ³

³ It is interesting to note that because national parks are conceived to be outside of nature, they have been and sometimes still are considered to be places that are innocent of politics. Bunn (2001) has shown how nationalist politics impinged increasingly on the administrative structures of the Kruger National Park, which saw various levels of
Following on from Cosgrove’s argument, one might say that the ‘lagged’ capitalist development of the East Africa colonies allowed Europeans to experience the enchanting emptiness of wilderness that had by that time become largely unavailable to those that lived in the ‘developed’ world. In the chapter ‘The Inverted Landscape’, I assert that the west would take physical and imaginative possession of spaces such as these during the colonial period, where during the transformative processes that attended the implementation of capitalism, wilderness would be seized for purposes of either development or preservation.

I argue that it was the Euro-American ideal of wilderness rooted in the Romantic tradition was what motivated colonial conservationists to relegate areas of land as national parks and reserves that were emptied of people but teeming with wildlife. A tradition of viewing landscape was imported into the East African colony and became reinvented in what we may call a ‘vision of wild Africa’ (Neumann 1995b: 154). It was a vision that eventually became realised in material form. Nature was produced in national parks according to the Euro-American ideal of Africa as primeval wilderness premised on the aesthetic of the Romantic sublime with its dual impulse: the quest for escape from a fragmenting and morally corrupting capitalist society, and search for the immutable and the transcendent in the 'untouched' wild landscape. That the physical manifestation of this vision came to be reflected in real space – the space of the East African national park - to my mind indicates most clearly what Mitchell has called the ‘dreamwork’ of imperialism (Mitchell 1994: 10).

Landscape, Mitchell tells us, is a particular historical formation associated with European imperialism (Mitchell 1994: 5). His assertion is in some measure based upon the fact that landscape had been the “chief artistic creation” of the nineteenth-century and must therefore have a relation to that other “chief creation” nineteenth-century – the system of global domination known as European imperialism (Mitchell 1994: 10). Nevertheless, he recognises that “imperialism is clearly not a simple, single or homogenous phenomenon but the name of a complex system of cultural, political and economic expansion and domination that varies with the specificity of places, peoples and historical moments (Mitchell 1994: 6). In doing so he acknowledges, as has been widely argued by post-colonial theorists, that imperialism cannot be consigned to a colonial past.

Intervention by the military, government, police, army and state labour recruiters from 1948 onwards, and in doing so has demonstrated how such spaces come to reflect the prevailing social order of the time.
Discussions of imperialism need not be confined to the nineteenth-century, or even to the period of colonialism itself, but are pertinent to questioning a continuing global economy that privileges western values and practices. Imperialism can be seen as a dominant constellation of ideas, theories and attitudes of a metropolitan center that continues to exert a forceful influence over a distant territory. Said, for instance, sees imperialism as a relationship in which "one state controls the effective political sovereignty of another political society". It is a situation not achieved by force, as in the past, but by political collaboration in which a relation of economic, social or cultural dependence is established. Said's understanding of imperialism, then, supersedes the historical specificity of the colonial state. Colonialism in his conceptualization is the effect or consequence of a formal type of imperialism that sought to domesticate and settle distant territory. Informal imperialism, the domination of a metropolitan centre exerted upon distant lands, is ongoing (Said 1993: http://www.zmag.org/zmag/articles/barsaid.htm 09.09.06).

Mitchell's essay 'Imperial landscape' has been especially influential because in it he sets out to displace the genre of landscape painting from its centrality in art-historical accounts in order to broaden 'landscape' from a term related specifically to mediums of representation to a more abstract concept in modernist discourse. Mitchell aims to decentre the association of painting and formal visuality in favour of a semiotic and hermeneutic approach that asks not just what landscape 'is or 'means' but what it does (Mitchell 1994: 1). By assuming a similar stance to Mitchell, I am able to ask a question fundamental to this investigation: how does landscape work as a cultural practice in the colonial and post-colonial context? In attempting to address this question I have not taken the course of identifying visual and textual artifacts - paintings or photographs - as objects of art historical interpretation. Rather, my aim has been to identify the cultural practices that allowed African wilderness, landscapes that were potentially inimical to western appropriations as Coetzee (1988) has suggested, to be seized upon as an expression of a particular imperialist vision during colonialism. I see the national park of East Africa (more specifically, of Tanzania) as an artefact of a romantic landscape tradition that was trans-located, transposed and transformed from its Euro-American origins onto the African continent during the period of imperialist endeavor.

The aim of this dissertation is to trace the implications that Western views of nature have had for the colonial restructuring of African landscapes through the creation of game reserves and national parks in East Africa, with a particular focus on Tanzania. The history of conservation, I argue, is fundamentally linked to both to imperialism and to global capitalism, which is why this landscape ideal persists in the post-colonial, post-socialist Tanzania of today. By the end of the colonial era, Tanganyika had gazetted three National Parks, six game reserves, the Ngorogoro Conservation area and a large number of Game Controlled Areas. After independence in 1961, the nationalist leadership Tanzania proclaimed the
protection of wildlife to be a priority, and so Tanzania continued the policy of setting aside protected areas devoted to wildlife conservation. This now covers up to twenty-seven percent the total land area of mainland Tanzania (Leader-Williams 2000: 223). Of this, sixteen percent of the country is devoted to protected areas in the form of national parks and game reserves where no permanent human settlement is allowed, and the remaining eleven percent is protected areas where wildlife co-exists with human settlement (ibid).

That such a high percentage of this country is protected in the name of conservation implies a concomitant loss of grazing, farming, hunting and foraging resources for local peoples, as has been pointed out by scholars looking at the social history of African environments such as Beinart (2003). But what is important to note is that the conservation of land, whether allowing or disallowing human settlement, implies the regulation of people’s relations to animals and landscapes by the government. I look at this issue in some detail in the chapter ‘The Contested Landscape’, where I explore the relationship between the implementation of game laws by state agencies and the resistance of local people in relation to the Serengeti-Ngorogoro case. What is clear is that conservation areas are among the most critical contexts in which rural resource users experience state power, for it is through conservation that the state transforms these people into either poachers or law-abiding citizens (Garland 2006: 62). National parks and reserves are frequently the sites of battles for access to natural resources by rural peasants and the efforts to control and own these resources by the state, whose administrative arm, the wildlife department, comprises the immediate context in which such struggles over land and land-use occur.

Commenting on Africans currently working in the safari industry in this country, Garland draws attention to the fact that African government officials and wildlife professionals who participate in creating this vision wild are actively engaged in perpetuating the western fascination wild spaces and creatures, in spite of the neocolonial overtones of this work (Garland 2006: 26).

. . . [I]n the work of producing the nature-intensive commodity that lies at the heart of the safari industry – wild beasts roaming free through empty plains or pristine forests – the Africans who establish game parks and manage wildlife populations rely upon and produce a particular ideology of nature, as much as they do the physical animals and landscapes themselves (Garland 2006: 52).

Here Garland takes note of the highly productive character of conservation processes. In her thesis she argues that the people who work in the safari industry in Tanzania are not merely passive recipients of agendas imposed on them by Western outsiders. Instead they are actively pursuing a conservation-led strategy for wildlife exploitation for personal benefit and to the benefit of the nation.
To produce a landscape in which wild animals roam free also requires the reproduction of a certain ideology of nature and of landscape. This may have been derived from the colonial period, but, crucially, it is a vision that has been enforced and even expanded by post-colonial regimes like Tanzania. Those working in the wild life industry in that country today labour to produce nature of a kind that is the most highly valued of all - the ‘empty’ landscapes of pristine wilderness inhabited only by the denizens of the wild. It is my view that the setting aside of wilderness reserves is a process fundamentally linked to both to imperialist conquest and to global capitalism where post-colonial states like Tanzania have become, in essence, a repository of wild nature for the rest of the world.
CHAPTER 1: The Represented Landscape

An Art-Historical Background to the Wilderness Ideal

Mitchell’s essay, 'Imperial landscape' argues that landscape in the twentieth century has primarily been read as a history of painting, with the result that it is narrated primarily as a progressive movement towards purification of the visual field. The movement towards abstraction over the last century has meant that landscape painting, with its emphasis on figurative realism, has placed the landscape as a medium on the very periphery of ‘serious’ art. Mitchell’s objective has been to centre the association of painting and formal visuality in favour of a semiotic and hermeneutic approach (associated with postmodernism) that asks not just what landscape ‘is or ‘means’ but what it does (Mitchell 1994: 1). For this reason, Mitchell’s theoretical stance is important to my discussion of wilderness landscape in East Africa. By assuming a similar stance, I am able to ask a question fundamental to my research project: how does landscape work as a cultural practice in the colonial and post-colonial context of the East African state?

The aim of this particular chapter is to identify and discuss the landscape aesthetic best associated with wilderness, the sublime. The purpose of doing do is to facilitate a discussion of ‘Landscapes Sublime’ in relation to the wilds of East Africa. However, to begin any discussion of the sublime in the context of Africa, I must first establish my argument in relation to what is considered a seminal work, White Writing by J.M.Coetzee (1988). Doing so will provide a foundational basis from which to begin my investigation of the wilderness landscape ideal, despite the fact that Coetzee’s discussion of landscape is in regard to representations of nineteenth-century British South Africa, while my discussion of landscape is located in twentieth-century East Africa.

Coetzee’s main contention is that the aesthetic of the sublime in painting and poetry did not take a firm hold in South Africa in the historic period of the nineteenth-century. In spite of this, he warns that one should be wary of taking up the position that the sublime could never have taken root "either because by the turn of the nineteenth-century it was a concept in desuetude or because it could not have endured the transplantation" (Coetzee 1988: 55). It could have easily been transposed to the mountains of South Africa and, indeed, numerous celebrations of the sublime limitlessness of the veld are to be found in poetry (Coetzee 1988: 53). But what he finds is that landscape painting, in comparison with American landscape painting, particularly of the Hudson River School with its luminous treatment of water, atmosphere and light, shows what the sublime could have become in South Africa but did not (Coetzee 1988: 56). In comparison with the Hudson River School, landscapes of nineteenth-century British South
Africa are described as having resisted a similar style of interpretation and representation; the land responded with silence to the poet with and blankness to the painter (Coetzee 1988: 9). But if the aesthetic of sublime seems to have been stilted, the empty wildernesses of South Africa did not easily acquiesce to the “wishful” aesthetic of the pastoral either. This resistance, Coetzee argues, may be attributed to a general barrenness and aridity. Dry wilderness landscapes that lacked atmospheric moisture refused easy association with the idea of a peopled landscape or a place for the self within it: "In this respect, the art of the empty landscape is the pessimistic obverse of a wishful pastoral art that by the labour of hands makes the landscape speak and peoples it with an ideal community" (Coetzee 1988: 9).

If the African landscape does not easily lend itself to the art of the pastoral, or what one might call the domesticating aesthetic of the picturesque, it does tend to ally itself to what may be called the rival dream topography of the sublime:

But there is a rival dream topography as well: of South Africa as a vast empty, silent space, older than man, older than the dinosaurs whose bones lie bedded in its rocks, and destined to be vast, empty and unchanged long after man had passed from its face. Under such a conception of Africa - "Africa, oldest of the continents" - the task of the human imagination is to conceive not a social order capable of domesticating the landscape, but any kind of relation at all that consciousness can have with it" (Coetzee 1988: 6-7).

It is in this sense, then, that wild and ancient nature beyond relation to humanity can be conceived of as 'axiologically inert' (Crowther 1989: 44). Such a landscape remains alien and impenetrable until a language can be found through which it can be represented or spoken. “Is there a language in which people of European identity . . . can speak to Africa and be spoken to by Africa?” Coetzee asks (Coetzee 1988: 8). The dream topography of empty silent ancient space resists an aesthetic based on English landscape tradition of property and cultivation. In doing so, preconceived cultural expectations are ruptured, and the projection of the moral and intellectual attributes 'within' the foreign self upon the environment cannot be achieved. The African wilderness is therefore a landscape that is better suited to the sublime, for "the sublime originates when conventional readings of landscape break down, but in their collapse recognizes the founding of another order of meaning" (Coetzee 1988: 54).

If the empty landscape had been the pessimistic obverse of a wishful pastoral art in nineteenth-century Africa, then by the twentieth century this wishful pastoralism had been widely realised, and large tracts of land in the colony had been settled and transformed by Europeans. In the context of a rapidly modernising Africa, I have discovered that a discussion of wilderness cannot be confined to the British landscape tradition alone, but must extend across the Atlantic to include America. There are several reasons for invoking an Anglo-American landscape aesthetic in my discussion, and it will be useful to explain why before I proceed any further. As Coetzee has recognized, the sublime took a firm hold in America, for which reason alone it merits discussion in relation to East Africa, for on both continents a
massive conquest and domestication of wilderness and 'wild' people took place. Moreover, the aesthetic most associated with wild and chaotic nature, the sublime, is the landscape of the African wilderness. It has also been pointed out that New World landscapes of Africa and America are similar in terms of geographic scale; "Wordsworth's mighty Helvellyn is but a foothill in the Rockies", as Bate puts it (Bate 1991: 39). Most importantly, in the American landscape sublime we encounter an aesthetic that linked a physical expanse to the expansiveness of the soul as a kind of ethos of 'Romantic nationalism'. The grand idea of the sublime in American landscape art was harnessed to the imperialist fantasy figured not only as God-ordained right but the inevitable teleology of a race “fitted for a spacious destiny” (Coetzee 1988: 58). Similarities in the expansionist rhetoric and the rugged athleticism associated with the colonial frontier, I believe, saw the African wilderness envisaged much the same way, a point that Wittenberg makes in his doctoral thesis The Sublime, Imperialism and The African Landscape (Wittenberg 2004: 227-228).

Coetzee has recognized two paradoxical impulses in the idea of wilderness, the first being the Judeo-Christian notion that wilderness is where "the law of nature reigns, a world over which the first act of culture, Adam's act of naming, has not been performed" (Coetzee 1988: 49-50). To name in the language of the coloniser that which had once been to them a terra incognita brought the land to order, even called it into cultural existence, and in doing so converted ‘empty’ spaces into places. A second notion has been identified in which ‘the wilds’ came to be seen as spaces of contemplation and purification, "where the true ground of one’s being could be rediscovered, even as a place as yet incorrupt in a fallen world" (Coetzee 1988: 49-50). It is this last that I am interested in exploring as a theme concomitant with the main understanding of the imperialist endeavor as one motivated primarily by profit. In East Africa, as had occurred in Europe and America, the global transformation of nature wrought by industrial capitalism came to inform both the physical and intellectual consumption of nature (Smith 1984: 1). As this transformation of the barren 'wastelands' of the colonies increasingly became a reality, there also came into existence the contradictory desire to preserve 'wild' landscape that was as yet untouched by the voracious capitalist development that was fast consuming vast tracts of land. In the developing East African colony wilderness was imagined to be "the natural, unfallen antithesis of an unnatural civilisation that has lost its soul" (Cronin 1995: 80). Nature 'incorrupt' became expressly linked to a landscape unmarked by capitalism or any form of human labour where travelers, settlers or tourists on safari could recover the 'true' selves they had lost to the corrupting influence of an overwhelming and artificial modernity.

This idea of wilderness continues to have currency, appearing as a kind of primitivist desire that stands in opposition to the advance of civilisation, as Oelschlaeger remarks:
Any talk of wilderness, of unpolluted blue sky and noble savages living in harmony with nature, seems mere nostalgia for a way of life gone forever, a romantic belief that threatens the advance of modern civilisation. In other words, the idea of wilderness represents primitivism (Oelschlaeger 1991: 285).

And yet it was primitive Africa that elaborated in the making of the modern European self-consciousness whereby Europe came to be defined in relation to Africa in vigorous debates about humanity, reason, and civilization. These debates had a distinct role to play in the social and cultural upheavals that accompanied the rise of capitalism (Comaroff 1991: 86). As Europeans refashioned their sense of themselves as polities on the world map and asserted their imperialist aims, there emerged an entanglement of positions about the non-west tied to intellectual, religious and philosophic justifications of colonialism. Dominion over African nature did not only include the mastery and control of distant colonial terrains, but also included the separation of indigenous peoples from their supposed state of nature. As Smith puts it, "the wilderness and the savage were as one . . . [both] were obstacles to be overcome in the march of progress and civilization (Smith 1984: 9).

Arguments favouring the domination, mastery, control or 'humanization' of nature are rooted in the Christian doctrine of dominion (Harvey 1996: 121). This is well illustrated in Edward B. Tylor's *Primitive Culture: Researches into the Development of Mythology, Philosophy, Religion, Art, and Custom* (1871) an influential work in two volumes in early anthropology that looked at religion in native societies. A large portion of the work is devoted to animism, the belief that natural objects and natural phenomena are possessed of a conscious life, which Tylor attributed to a earlier stage in the evolution of religion. Animism was the manifestation of a primitive form of religion while the Christian idea of a single deity was seen as being the most evolved and ideal form of all religious belief systems. Tylor’s work was premised on the anthropocentric claim that 'mankind' is the premeditated aim of the creation of the earth, a notion peculiar to the Judeo-Christian philosophic tradition, as is expressed in this passage from Milton’s “Paradise Lost” (Slater 1995: 115):

\[
\text{Let us make now Man in our image, Man} \\
\text{In our similitude, and let them rule} \\
\text{Over the fish and fowl of sea and air,} \\
\text{Beast of the field, and over all the Earth,} \\
\text{And every creeping thing that creeps the ground.}
\]

The solipsistic placement of 'mankind' as the central element of the universe predisposed western 'man' to see himself as elevated and distinct from the rest of nature with the entire world at his disposal. If the resources of the earth were the means by which he could improve 'his' quality of his life, then manipulation of natural surrounds through industry and science was perceived as the right of all humanity. But it was mostly the white male of the species who extensively exercised his sovereign rights and mastery over nature. The extraction of resources, the production of commodities and the practices of
industry and commerce appeared to place 'civilised man' at the forefront of an evolutionary teleology. The unequal material development of different races became directly analogous to biological evolution in which difference became the sign of a "theological, biological, and anthropological destiny" (Mudimbe 1990: 17).

The Virgillian Allegory of Progress from Savagery to Civilisation

Claude Lorrain (1600 - 1682), Salvator Rosa (1615-1673) and Poussin (1615 - 1675) were the primary early exponents of the nature painting which had a highly influential effect on the English landscape tradition. Their paintings were studied and imitated throughout the eighteenth-century, and found expression in new forms of landscape gardening where landed property was made to resemble a landscape painting (Thaker 1983: 33-34). Salvator was admired as a painter of "Wild and Savage Nature" and as a practitioner of a "Great and Noble" style and became representative of what constituted the sublime in landscape: "His rocks and mountains, blasted trees and waterfalls, storms and gloom (already dubbed sublime by the theorizers of the 1730s and 1740s) were ‘happily suggestive’ of aspects of the external world which would become popular with lovers of nature (Monk 1960: 195). Uvedale Price drew the conventional contrast between Salvator Rosa and Claude. While Salvator Rosa’s scenes suggest death, gloom and destruction that "terrifies and alarms the imagination", Claude "delights the eye and mind" with images that suggest peace security and happiness (ibid). In short, Salvator Rosa was associated with the sublime, and Claude came to be associated with the beautiful (Monk 1960: 194).

In Claude's paintings of rural idylls, 'nature' is found just beyond the confines of the city. These invented landscapes comprise scenes of the Roman Campagna, and are described in terms of the human enjoyment of pastoral life and the rustic pleasures such a space would afford: couples strolling in country estates and gardens, groups travelling amongst caves, cliffs and ancient ruins, the solitary hunter in the wooded hills or fisherman seated beside the canal or lake. Clark has described Claude’s paintings with their grazing flocks, reflective waters and calm luminous skies as depictions of the perfect harmony between man and nature. Claude’s work was peopled by diminutive figures encompassed by a vast natural world that is overwhelmingly figured as beneficent. It was a conception of landscape that combined the element of realism "with the most enchanting dream which has ever consoled mankind, the myth of a Golden Age in which man lived on the fruits of the earth, peacefully, piously and with primitive simplicity" (Clark 1949: 109).

Claude’s invention, the Claude glass, was widely used by British artists and tourists of ‘picturesque’ scenery because it enabled the observer to frame the landscape as an image of allusion – in other words, as if it were already a work of art. The Claude glass was a small, portable mirror backed with a dark foil,
and if the view in the mirror approximated the Claudian landscape ideal, it was judged sufficiently ‘picturesque’ to be appreciated and even to be sketched or painted. Not only did it conjure the ordinary landscape as art, but later variations tinted the glass so that a daytime in scene could instantly be rendered in the more atmospheric and metaphorically suggestive hues of dawn or sunset (Schama 1995: 11-12). Claude was seen as particularly influential on the British landscape tradition in other ways too, for his paintings were "especially valued for their classical, and more especially for the Virgilian, associations they evoked" (Barrell 1980: 9). The works of both Virgil and Ovid had been a longstanding influence upon landscape painting, but Virgil was the main source of inspiration (Clark 1949: 109). The reason for this, Clark says, is because he was the master of the myth of ideal rusticity. Virgil's poetic works are in effect a description of the progress of society from its birth to its demise, with each stage expressive of a particular formation of the landscape idea. However, Virgil is especially interesting because his narrative is in effect a description of a development from 'savagery to civilisation', and therefore has pertinence to a discussion of the imperial landscape ideal. It involves a movement from dark, barren, undeveloped nature, or Natura naturans, to its civilized, ideal form, Natura naturata (Merchant 1995: 149).

Virgil saw society in its infancy as Pastoral, posited in terms of a 'natural' relationship between humans and the environment, which over time progressed to the Georgic society of agriculturalists and husbandmen who cultivated the land more intensively in accord with the needs of human life. In this period humans actively cultivated the potential of the earth as well as the potential of culture towards realizing a perfected society (Merchant 1995: 139). Finally, the Aeneid reveals the emergence of Rome as a city of culture and civilization within the pastoral and agricultural landscapes. It is the city in the garden (urbs in horto), an urban society removed from nature but sustained by outlying areas in which in which the concerns of commerce, competition and war prevail (Merchant 1995: 139) (Cosgrove 1984: 67). Cosgrove sees Virgil's poetic works as an allegory describing the progress from nature to culture in which each stage is destroyed in the realization of the next:

The progress from nature to culture is the progress from innocence to experience, from free sharing to individual acquisition, from ploughshares to swords which ultimately mean the death of society and a return to the wilderness of untamed nature. Each stage carries within itself the seeds of destruction and replacement by the succeeding stage in an endlessly recurring cycle (Cosgrove 1984: 67)

In Cosgrove's reading, the journey from nature to culture is the prototypical fall from grace. It is a narrative that progresses from the rural garden where humans exist in a state of natural innocence at one with the land towards a civilization centred on the city where humans exist in a state of knowledge, but are alienated from the land. It is a narrative that encapsulates an insoluble dilemma, for while the Pastoral may be conceived as a paradise lost, the Roman Empire with its knowledge, republican
government, culture, philosophy and technical mastery is conceived as a high point of social organization in that epoch - altogether a 'paradise' of another gained.

The Virgillian allegory can be applied to the current social formation of capitalism, often seen as spiritually barren in comparison to an earlier 'pastoral' way of life. Some commentators suggest that capitalism fails to fulfill our deeper needs, but it does offer the prospect of a technological society in which citizens are able to enjoy a material abundance heretofore unknown. Marx recognized the utopian potential of capitalism, which he saw as having the unrealized ability to shorten the working day or to generally relieve humans from the drudgery of labour. But he also foresaw that capitalism's internal dynamism towards growth would instead "stultify human labour into a material force:

On the one hand, there have started into life industrial and scientific forces which no epoch of human history had ever suspected. On the other, there exists symptoms of decay, far surpassing the horrors of the latter times of the Roman Empire. In our days, everything is pregnant with its contrary. Machinery, gifted with the wonderful power of shortening and fructifying human labour, we behold starving and overworking it . . . All our invention and progress seem to result in endowing material forces with intellectual life, and stultifying human life into a material force (Berman quoting Marx 1982:20).

Despite the grand rhetoric of modern invention and progress, on the level of the individual capitalist labour is frequently associated with alienation, spiritual stultification and psychological dislocation, as Marx's writings have described.

In the spatial relations of land, the city is the centre of the marketplace and of production that spreads outward concentrically to encompass outlying areas, agricultural land and the land beyond that, until all becomes capitalized in the interests of commodity production. In this conceptualisation, agricultural land can be considered "merely space extensive industries dependent on the life of the urban market-place" (Cosgrove 1984: 44). The countryside can no longer be imagined as the opposite of the city, the locus of a rural idyll, but rather the spatially spread-out structures of a singular social formation - the monoculture of industrial capitalism. Just as with the concentric effect of the city upon the outlying environment, the capitalist economy can be conceived on a global scale as a relation between metropole and periphery, where imperial powers centered in Europe monopolise outlying colonies as markets for raw materials and profit in the "displacement of the country-city dichotomy onto world geography" (Bunn 1994, 129). This description of imperialist spatial relations recalls the 'city in the garden' that Virgil described in the Aenid in which the 'civilized' central place surrounded by a cultivated inner zone, a pastoral outer zone and finally, a chaotic 'wild' periphery (Merchant 1995: 138-139).

The ever-expanding market coupled to the exponential growth of the human population has generated concern about the sustainability of a system that is forever expanding into the limited environment of
earth’s resources. This apocalyptic scenario of infinite consumption within a finite resource is a symptom of capitalism's corrosion that Marx surmised would surpass the horrors of the late Roman Empire. Some commentators, however, see the rise of the 'Capitalist Empire' as transitory an occurrence in the history of humankind as that earlier great civilization, the Roman Empire. Their view is not unlike Virgil's narrative that sees the decline and fall of Rome as an inevitable part of a cycle in which the city which returns to the chaos of wilderness, and with its demise there emerges the possibility of a second golden age (Merchant 1995: 139). Virgil's vision of the 'natural cycle' offers us no consolation in the climate of late capitalism. We fear that we have perhaps tested nature too far, and by doing so wonder what the near future holds for humanity and for other species who compete with humankind for survival. The fear is that 'unnatural' but apparently 'organic' capital grows wild, especially in urban 'jungles', whereas it is nature which is subject to careful planning and organisation. Part of the planning of nature has been the identification and legalization of areas of the environment by the West to be protected from commercial exploitation as national parks and reserves, and this is where untouched and uncultivated land is most frequently to be found. These are, in the main, the world's last refuges of wilderness. Paradoxically, then, it may be said that we preserve nature through culture and secure 'wildness' by the very act of its domestication (Cronin 1995: 89).

Wilderness and the Romantic Sensibility

The subjective immersion of the European self in wilderness was essentially an anathema to the perceived right of human beings to order and master nature. And yet wilderness in the western mind was imagined as a space inherently closer to the metaphysical realm, whether as a place of terror, transgression and danger or spiritual quietude, contemplation and purification. Part of the changing perception of wilderness can be traced to the emergence in the west of a pantheistic quest associated with the Romantic sublime - in essence the quest for transcendence in nature. Thaker's book The Wilderness Pleases (1983) traces the origins of Romanticism and the changing idea of nature in Britain from Shaftesbury's declaration of his "Passion . . . for Things of a natural kind" (Thaker 1983: 31) (original emphasis). The Third Earl of Shaftesbury's philosophical and aesthetic statement of 1709 saw artificiality and formality as inferior to a 'freer' approach to the natural world that found pleasure in nature's wilder aspect. This revolution in taste came to be reflected in a multitude of ways, but is perhaps best expressed in the growing disapproval of the decorative garden's 'unnatural' aspect. The restrained and orderly formal garden would gradually disappear over the course of the century as society formed a penchant for rugged scenes rather than harmonious surrounds. Gardens that showed "the marks of the Scissars upon every Plant and Bush" were replaced by a new landscape aesthetic that aspired to the perfect representation of untamed nature, as for example in the 'natural wilderness' of William Beckford's Fonthill estate in Wiltshire (Thacker 1983:33). Notably, Lancelot (Capability) Brown’s judicious designs made gardens
disguised as works of nature with such skill that they could be mistaken by the less sophisticated for nature itself.

Shaftesbury has also been identified as a precursor of the aesthetic of the sublime. In 1711 he turned to the subject of enthusiasm as an exalted state of the soul that arises from a perception of beauty whose power "naturally captivates the Heart, and raises the Imagination to an Opinion or Conceit of some thing majestic and divine" (Monk 1960: 208) (original emphasis). His appreciation of objects of the natural world lay beyond formulaic conventions of beauty to be found in prevailing Neo-classicist ideals of form, harmony and line (Monk 1960: 208-209). Due to Shaftesbury’s enormous influence as a philosopher at that time, such passages would have served as an incentive to the appreciation of the wild and the ‘primitive’ in nature; in other words it was an aesthetic that was aligned with ‘the sublime’.

What has become apparent from my review of a range of material is that even in its eighteenth-century the term ‘sublime’ was a highly contested term, for its meaning was, and still is, based in individual experience and is philosophically addressed to the nebulous and highly subjective experience of 'being moved' (Ashfield & de Bolla 1996: 2). The sublime was used to describe a sudden 'elevation' of the soul, the experience of being overwhelmed (ekstasis) and the sensation of enthralment (ekpleksis) arising out of an aesthetic response to the natural world or to art (Weiskel 1976: 5). The very indistinctness of the term contributed to its longevity as a central subject in philosophy and the arts. And yet, even when still ‘technically’ attached to the philosophical debates of the eighteenth-century the meanings of the word evolved as thinkers contributed to a complex history of a prolific century and a half’s vigorous debate. As Monk has commented, this “mass of material” with its competing views and interpretations cannot easily be reduced to a coherency without reducing the complexity of the field (Monk 1960:3). There is no need to reiterate here the origins and evolution of the sublime so admirably dealt with in Monk’s 1935 study, because my purpose is to discuss the sublime in the context of twentieth-century modernity. For this purpose Nye’s book, The American Technological Sublime (1994) has proved invaluable. The point I want to make is that the sublime was an exceedingly malleable term in its day, and is even more so now, even if the sublime may have lost much of its original currency as a term and potency as a concept.

In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries the sublime was one of the central concepts around which debates on art, nature and aesthetics evolved, and was particularly pertinent to the traditions of Neoclassicism and Romanticism that held sway in that period. The wide applicability of the sublime is demonstrated by Hildebrand Jacob's (1837) description of the variety of contexts in which the concept of the sublime appears:

All the vast, and wonderful scenes, either of delight, or horror, which the universe affords have this effect upon the imagination, such as unbounded prospects, particularly that of the ocean, in its
different situations of agitation or repose; the rising or setting sun; the solemnity of moon light; all the phaenomena in the heavens, and objects of astronomy. We are moved in the same manner by the view of dreadful precipices; great ruins; subterraneous caverns, and the operations of nature in those dark recesses... the sight of numerous armies, and assemblies of people ... the whispering of winds; the fall of waters in cataracts, or heavy showers; the roaring of the sea; the noise of tempests amongst lofty trees; thunder; the clash of arms, and voice of war (Ashfield & de Bolla 1996: 53).

'The sublime' was defined in a complex and sometimes contradictory way among writers over the century and a half where it was the pre-eminent topic of philosophical debate. It conveyed not only sensations of delight or horror in relation to nature, but could be invoked by great assemblies of people, the clash of arms, the voice of war, or the evidence of great civilizations to be found in man-made objects such as great architectural sites or ruins that could evoke a sense of grand history. The sublime may have been predominantly described in terms of natural phenomena, as we see in the passage cited above, but it could include crowds and even warfare. This immediately raises questions of how the sublime can be different from, or the same as, religious enthusiasm, the transports of travel or the glory of war (Ashfield and de Bolla 1996: 9). This is a question that will remain unanswered here, but I will say that it appears that all of these things have ‘uses’ for the rhetoric of the sublime. Indeed, Coetzee has recognized that the imperial landscape has uses for the sublime because it is an aesthetic that can lend itself to the politics of expansion, conquest and grandeur (Coetzee 1988: 62). For this reason the sublime has certain applicability to my discussions of imperialism in the context of colonial East Africa.

The influence of theories of the sublime can be traced to Dennis, Addison and Shaftesbury’s eighteenth-century writings that extolled the aesthetic appreciation of wild nature. With this newfound enjoyment came a revolution in taste that embraced ‘natural’ scenery. The aesthetic of the sublime became associated with a love of the wild and grand aspects of nature that challenged the Neo-classical prejudice against “the formless, the wild and the uncouth” (Monk 1060: 208).

Thus, from the very onset in England, the sublime tended to become the all-inclusive category for those objects and those emotions which in the strict neo-classic doctrine could not admit as beautiful, but which Englishmen were traditionally and constitutionally ready to accept as of aesthetic value, until finally in Burke’s Enquiry, the ugly itself came to play a part in this aesthetic. In respect to natural objects, as in theory, the sublime is found aligned on the side of the more romantic element in eighteenth-century taste (Monk 1960: 208).

In nature it was the sublime that tended to be aligned with romantic eighteenth-century taste. This was, in essence, a taste for things ‘unbeautiful’ and was expressed mainly as an appreciation for natural objects and forces of nature. Mountains, once considered appalling inconveniences and ‘monstrous excrescences’ upon the landscape became to be revered as scenery, as Nicholson has elaborated in her book Mountain Gloom And Mountain Glory (1959). Unbounded prospects, dreadful precipices, great ruins, subterranean caverns, cataracts and chasms, mighty thunderstorms, even the roaring of the sea or wind amongst lofty
trees could be occasion for the sublime (Ashfield & de Bolla 1996: 53). The vastness and savagery of nature's spectacle, crashing waterfalls or mountainous chasms or tumultuous ocean become, so to speak, mirrored in the perceiving consciousness as a flood of ecstasy or transcendental power. This occurred most often in the perception of the objects in the natural world that were vast or frightening from which a strong emotional reaction of fear, pain or horror could emerge.

The most notable contributor to theories of the sublime in the English context is Edmund Burke who, in an effort to address the ambiguity that had existed up until that point in *Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of Our Ideas of the Sublime and the Beautiful* (1757). Previous to this “no exact theory of our passions, or a knowledge of their genuine sources” had existed in any comprehensive form, which one of the reasons why he, of the many commentators of that period, remains widely cited today (Monk 1960: 86). Burke’s writings on the sublime have been recognised as particularly pertinent on several counts. He emphasised those awe-inspiring aspects of nature that were shown to be capable of eliciting an overpowering emotional response, and in doing so, shifted the emphasis away from the rhetorical sublime of the Longinian tradition epitomised by great works of revelation or imagination such as Dante’s *Inferno*. Instead of discussing the sublime in relation to preconceived ideas, Burke drew on experiential sources because he was most concerned with ascertaining how objects affect the human passions. Translated into today’s terms this is, I suppose, tantamount to finding the sources of great psychological and physiological effect. In his discussions of the sensory and emotive affects of objects upon the human subject, he rendered the sublime more accessible than it had been before (Cosgrove 1984: 227). Burke’s ‘psychology of affect’ relating the sublime to the human passions ‘democratised’ what had previously been an elitist figure of thought with the result that the sublime was increasingly appropriated to the middle classes' tastes and experiences over the course of the eighteenth-century, which frequently took the form of the landscape tour.

It was Rev. William Gilpin who proposed the picturesque or ‘Grand Tour’ in which aesthetic theory and topographical observation were combined in tours of Italy and of England between 1770 and 1780. When enthusiasts set off for the mountains, it was William Gilpin who would instruct them in what they were to see (Monk 1960: 223). All of Gilpin’s tours bore the subtitle “Relative chiefly to Picturesque beauty” because the original use of the word ‘picturesque’ did not exclude the sublime. The term ‘picturesque’ was used by Uvedale Price to identify an aesthetic category that would mediate between the Burkean sublime, with its emphasis on terror, and the beautiful. The ‘picturesque’ view, then, can be understood primarily as an apprehension of external nature according to preconceived ideas of art.

Tourists sought a nature that lent itself to Claude’s dreamy pastorals as well as dramatic and sublime scenery of Salvator Rosa (Monk 1960: 223). With this development, the social and cultural importance of
the Grand Tour took on a new emphasis in which English men and women, including those of the middle classes, took to travel for the purpose of viewing 'scenery'. As the contemplation of landscape became a widespread cultural recreation, mass consumption of the picturesque through tourism and the emergence of printed reproductions of landscape imagery led to the widespread usage of the term 'picturesque'. These tours emphasized a way of viewing landscape according to pictorial rules as if they were paintings. Gilpin’s writing on the picturesque after 1782 reveals that the picturesque was a primarily considered to be that quality capable of being illustrated in painting. As Monk describes, the quality that Gilpin sought in nature was not nature itself, but an accidental element of art in nature (Monk 1960: 222-223). Consequently the tourist consumption of landscape could either conform to traveler’s expectations or disappoint them.

Preconceived ideas of what landscape should look like were commonly derived from Claude or Salvator Rosa or their adherents and imitators, as is demonstrated in this excerpt from Thomas West’s Guide to the Lakes (1778):

[F]rom the delicate touches of Claude, verified on Conniston lake, to the noble scenes of Poussin, exhibited on Windemere-water, and from these, to the stupendous romantic ideas of Salvator Rosa, realized on the lake at Derwent (Monk 1960: 223).

This passage demonstrates how the visual consumption of landscape was strongly derived from artistic convention. It was a mode of experiencing landscape that was continued in later books such as Turner’s Picturesque views in England and Wales, published between 1826 and 1838, and which contained drawings collected from 30 years during which Turner conducted professional tours to sites of England and Wales (Helsinger in Mitchell 1994: 108). Such books continued to emphasise the ‘composing eye’ through which the landscape was framed, thereby staging certain views as exemplary. Travellers familiar with Turner’s scenes could recognize certain landscape views from his books which were representative not only of Turner’s artistic vision but of a way of seeing the land as landscape. The seekers after ‘scenes’ thus submitted the external world to an artistic vision; through the power of the eye the natural landscape became subordinate to a ‘cultivated’ regard that did not celebrate nature in and of itself, but esteemed nature as art (Monk 1960: 222-223). Thus the sublime landscape was for Gilpin a scene to be apprehended by the eye, rather than be grasped by its imaginative and emotional effect, as was Burke’s essential claim.

Wordsworth’s communion with nature was very different to Gilpin’s approach. He positioned himself against the fashionable cult of landscape appreciation, and, as he wrote in The Prelude, thought that the tourist’s ongoing “comparison of scene with scene” was “bent overmuch on superficial things”. Instead his landscape aesthetic was one which sought “the affectation, and the spirit of the place” (Monk 1960: 229-230). Wordsworth rejected the jargon and formulaic interpretations of landscape in terms of art so
foundational to the fashionable picturesque tour, and found in nature “a sense sublime” rather than a visual approximation of it. He intuited in nature “something far more deeply interfused”, as he wrote in *Tintern Abbey*, and it is this poem that seems to reveal most strikingly his “faculty for receiving the unseen spiritual reality and for interpreting his perceptions in terms of religious symbolism” (Monk 1960:228).

What the Romantics sought was the sublime landscape associated with grander aspects of nature and the immensity of space particularly associated with mountain heights and depths, and vast, awe-inspiring expanses such as the ocean. They cultivated an aesthetic sensitivity towards nature’s wild and mysterious aspects which revealed to them a sense of divine presence which they considered immanent in such places. In the Romantic’s quest for the numinous in nature, transcendence, previously confined to the realm of religion, became transposed onto the wild landscape in a variety of forms.

The ontological significance that Romantics like Wordsworth attached to the wild landscape was related to the changing value of land under industrial capitalism whereby it was no longer regarded as metaphorically and figuratively barren, but became imbued with symbolic value as spaces of contemplation and purification. The aesthetic regard for wild landscape has been generally understood as a critical response to the rise of industrialism in Europe in opposition to the dissecting eye and analytical logic of science, where observations of natural processes were converted to the power of water and steam, and the heat and light of combustion. While Romantics such as Ruskin may have endorsed the detailed observational techniques derived from the natural sciences, his emphasis on the close observation of nature was used instead to metaphysical ends.

In the immersion of poets and painters in the contemplation of the natural world, a world experienced subjectively and poetically rather than understood in the rational sense as a distanced object of enquiry, Romanticism became an inherent critique of the existing social order.

Romanticism also spilled over into social criticism: modern society, the romantics believed, threatened human freedom and individuality, and poets like Lord Byron and Percy Bysshe Shelley proclaimed the justice of revolution against tyranny. They also rejected the Hobbesian-Smithian idea that society was nothing more than a mechanism orchestrating the actions of human atoms - individuals blindly pursuing self interest. And, like the wilderness prophets of old, the Romantics reacted adversely to the city, finding it oppressive (Oelschlaeger 1991: 99).

Yet, according to Cosgrove, romanticism acted as a justification of the capitalist order in that it mystified the very social relations against which it protested. The quest for the sublime romantic landscape was an ideology which appeared to criticize industrial capitalism but in fact hid its implications for land and human life by avoiding society (Cosgrove 1984: 234). Romantics celebrated along with the economist the central myth of capitalism, that is, the 'naturalness' of the isolated individual (Cosgrove 1984: 231). And because the moral order of society has been largely replaced by an economic order, the Romantic sought
not to change what was seen as inevitable, but to escape it by seeking out a landscape of a particular kind. If cultivated land, resources and labour were increasingly conceived of as unnatural, nature could only exist where human society had not intervened, or at least where the appearance of non-intervention could be sustained, namely in the wild and unused parts of the environment (Cosgrove 1984: 232):

The changed meaning of the sublime, whereby at the beginning of the nineteenth century it could properly be found in those wild, uncultivated places untouched by an unnatural and inorganic society, was in part a cultural response to the advent of an industrial market society. Against the unnatural but apparently 'organic' growth of capital whose fertility was apparently greater than that of land, the romantic sublime proclaimed a natural and properly organic intrinsic value located in the soul of the individual - notably the poet or artist - and in the processes and phenomena of the external world, especially those which underlined human insignificance and weakness: barren mountain recesses, storms, seas and night (Cosgrove 1984: 230).

The exemplary landscape of the romantic sensibility was wilderness, where primitive nature, as opposed to a nature domesticated or civilised, could be found.

A growing disillusionment with landscape painting and its eventual decline as a preeminent genre, Cosgrove suggests, was largely coterminous with Ruskin's lifespan (1819 - 1900) and his landscape project which was an attempt to "sustain the moral order implicit in the child's and pre-capitalist conceptions of human relations with the land and nature against the economic order of industrial capitalism" (Cosgrove 1984: 252). His writings about landscape can therefore be read as a commentary upon the changes that the English landscape underwent during the ascendancy of market capitalism in that period (Cosgrove 1984: 251). Ruskin had given two lectures in 1884 entitled The Storm Cloud of the Nineteenth Century in which he figured the deterioration of the climate as a cloud of pollution: "one loathsome mass of sultry and foul fog, like smoke". To Ruskin, Victorian England was beset by a 'plague wind', an analogical expression of moral decline that threatened his vision of harmony between human life and nature. Ruskin came to see that his vision of mankind in harmony with nature would never be realised in a political economy enamoured with industrial growth and immersed in the immoral greed of the marketplace (Cosgrove 1984: 250-251). The ascendancy of triumphant market capitalism left Ruskin in a broken world:

The harmony is now broken, and broken the world around: fragments still exist, and hours of what is past still return, but month by month the darkness gains upon the day, and the ashes of the Antipodes glare through the night (Ruskin 1884 quoted in Cosgrove 1984: 250).

Using the rhetoric of the sublime, Ruskin conveys his horror of industrialisation's gains upon the natural landscape, suggesting not only the fragmenting effect of its increasing encroachment upon the natural world, but implying a concomitant fragmentation of self and encroachment upon the human psyche.

Marx had recognized the immensely personal influence of the market upon the individual in terms of his concept of the alienation of capitalist labour, but also in the observation that in capitalism all values seem
to be subsumed by a single value – the value of commercial exchange: "The bourgeoisie has resolved all personal honour and dignity into exchange-value; and in place of the freedoms that men have fought for, it has put one unprincipled freedom - free trade" (Marx quoted in Berman 1982:111). Marx argued that bourgeois society did not efface older structures of morality or replace values of honour and dignity, but instead these structures and values were incorporated into the marketplace, where they would take on a price and a new life as commodities. In this way, any mode of human conduct would become morally permissible if it was economically profitable, or, as Berman puts it, “anything goes as it pays” (Berman 1982:111). The morally bereft capitalist ethos that had seemed so abhorrent to Ruskin is the very profit-based promiscuity that Berman sees as the very basis of modern nihilism (Berman 1982:111).

Ruskin had attacked the science of economics because it "promoted a model of human conduct that was entirely mercenary and a model of nature which transposed it to commodities and located their value in exchange" (Cosgrove 1984: 252). Recognizing this, Ruskin feared that Englishmen would be consigned to live diminished lives in a land that had become a giant factory for the production of commodities, a situation where the natural landscape of England would be consumed in its entirety:

> All England may, if it so chooses, become one manufacturing town; and Englishmen, sacrificing themselves to the good of general humanity, may live diminished lives in the midst of noise, of darkness, and of deadly inhalation. But the world cannot become a factory or a mine. No amount of ingenuity will ever make iron digestible by the million, nor substitute hydrogen for wine. Neither the avarice nor the rage of men will ever feed them (Ruskin 1862 quoted in Bates 1991: 0)

Under the ethos of industrial capitalism the whole of England, he says, may become a manufacturing town or massive factory geared toward the production of commodities. The cost of it will be noise and the darkness of smog. If the whole of England becomes a factory, Ruskin asks, where does the produce come from to feed the workers? Just as the town relies upon the outlying environment for raw produce, the capitalist economy can be conceived on a global scale as a relation between metropole and periphery, where England is the manufacturing city and Africa is the agricultural garden that will supply the centre with food. But Africa, like the rest of the world, is also subject to capitalist development.

Cosgrove sees the discourse of landscape as having atrophied as an active force in cultural production in England – in poetry, painting and landscape design - in the late nineteenth century as a direct result of the tightening grip of industrial capitalism that would increasingly separate humans from the earth. Land functioned in pre-capitalist society to produce food for the sustenance of human life, and so the landscape idea in pre-capitalist formations was attached to idealized human labour and an ideal of the productive earth. In the capitalist transition humankind became increasingly alienated from the land that in previous social formations had been integrally part of daily life and formed the fundamental basis of human communities. This condition of alienation Cosgrove regards as being especially reflected in the
sentimentality of the late Victorian picturesque. To him, the picturesque landscape tradition faltered on into the twentieth-century as a debased and retrospective aesthetic in that it continued to present an "image of unchanging rural bliss, an arcadia set in some past time when humans lived an easy and somehow 'natural' life in a village community unscathed by technology" (Cosgrove 1984: 265). This is not to say that the idealized pastoral landscape lost its appeal or was no longer relevant, but rather to suggest that the backward-looking sentimentalism of country scenes that obliterate any sign of technology or change perhaps reflected an alienated relationship between humans and land within a world given to modern agricultural enterprise. What is important to note is that images depicting the ideal of a beneficient, humanised earth have tended to be linked to the picturesque landscape tradition, while the ideal of the wild, untouched or unhumanised earth is associated with the sublime.

The Contemporary Sublime

"Landscape in the form of the picturesque European tradition", Mitchell tells us, "may well be an 'exhausted medium', at least for the purposes of serious art of self critical representation; that very exhaustion however, may signal an enhanced power at other levels . . .and a potential for renewal in other forms, other places" (Mitchell 1994: 3-4). Landscape painting may have atrophied in painting from the late nineteenth-century but it still has currency as a concept, and continues to be an influential force particularly where landscapes of wilderness occur, for it is the wild landscape that appears to best sustain an earlier tradition of viewing - namely a tradition derived from the Romantic landscape ideal. Since the Romantic tradition arose out of the forces of capitalist development, and capitalism is the primary social formation of contemporary society, this contention deserves some attention.

It seems that the idea of the untouched landscape is overwhelmingly prevalent in contemporary views of what is deemed worthy of aesthetic contemplation. According to Mitchell 'pure' viewing of landscape is spoiled by economic considerations - “you cannot freely admire a noble landscape, if labourers are digging in the field hard by” (Mitchell 1994: 15). Landscape must represent itself as the antithesis of 'land', to be seen as 'poetic' property rather than material property before it can become a potentially inexhaustible source of cultural value:

The land, real property, contains a limited quantity of wealth in minerals, vegetation, water and dwelling space. Dig out all the gold in a mountainside, and its wealth is exhausted. But how many photographs, postcards, paintings, and awestruck 'sightings' of the Grand Canyon will it take to exhaust its value as landscape? Could we fill up Grand Canyon with its representations? How do we exhaust the value of a medium like landscape? (Mitchell 1994: 15).

Mitchell suggests that the value of landscape lies in its potential to be endlessly appropriated by culture. Much of that appropriation consists of tourist sightings, which means that the majority of its
contemporary representations take the form of the snapshot (the personal photographic souvenir) or the postcard (the representative or ‘endorsed’ view commercially available as a photographic souvenir). But to exhaust the value of landscape is a simple matter, according to Cosgrove's formulation. If land is put to use for economic benefit it becomes immediately desacrilised. A gold mine would not only deplete the mineral wealth of the Grand Canyon over time, it would signify a landscape of labour that would mar the "majestic views" of a place popularly understood to be one of nature's most pristine panoramas. The uplifting vistas that provide intimations of the sublime to thousands of 'awestruck' sightseers will be, so to speak, 'despoiled'. The value of the land would then shift from contemplative to productive; that is, it would signify its availability as a site of potential commercial exploitation. Vast areas of the Grand Canyon, however, are preserved as a national park specifically to prevent its appropriation by industry or settlement, and its use-value has instead become invisibly harnessed to the machinery of tourism which, it is supposed, does not disturb the aesthetic consumption of the landscape. In Mitchell's elaboration of this American national park as a quintessential landscape viewing site we find an example of the conceptual schism between land that has a use-value and the ‘poetic’ landscape, which requires all signs of the socio-economic realm to be excised from view.

The Grand Canyon was, along with Yosemite, Rainier and Zion, among the first sites that the Americans chose for their national parks after Yellowstone National Park was declared. Yellowstone became the model for the national parks in the Third World and in particular tropical East Africa and the Kruger National Park in South Africa (Neumann 1998, Carruthers 1995). The significance of this was that it set a precedent for the national park to become a site of aesthetic and leisured consumption. Yellowstone was conceived as a "pleasing ground" (the term used in the original legislation) and was backed in Congress by the railroad industry, which saw in it the potential to increase the number of commuters through mass tourism (Neumann 1998:24).

The critical component, symbolically and practically, of the law that created Yellowstone as a model for all of the world's national parks was the prohibition against human settlement and activities. This clause reflects the essence of the landscape way of seeing: the removal of all evidence of human labour, the separation of the observer from the land, and the spatial division of production and consumption (Neumann 1998:24).

The national park can be understood as a primary site of nature consumption by an increasingly mobile and urban society (Neumann 1998:24). The national parks model in tropical Africa was derived in part from the Anglo-American landscape aesthetic encapsulated in Yellowstone National Park, which provided the conceptual anchor for the national parks in Africa. Yellowstone was conceived as a landscape of consumption – a 'pleasure ground' where leisure and recreation is emphasised and labour excised from view (Neumann 1998:24). So too was the Grand Canyon, a national park that Nye identifies as one of the
paradigmatic sites of the natural sublime in America. These natural landscapes, untouched by human production, are the contemporary locus of Nye calls 'the consumer sublime'(Nye 1994: 288).

The Grand Canyon is a supreme example of nature produced culturally, aesthetically and for consumption. With its staggering visitor record of five million people entering the park in 1993, it is a veritable tourist gold mine. Indeed, the park's administrators have consulted with the Disney Company to find ways of coping with the massive amount of tourists for which current facilities are inadequate. As Nye remarks, “the national park thus becomes a species of theme park, making available a relatively unspoiled nature which society has spared from development” (Nye 1994: 287). But the Grand Canyon has not been altogether spared from development. Part of the its attraction and interest is that it is threatened by an array of technologies and so "should be seen immediately before it is further defiled" by the smog of pollution blowing in from the west that obscures the view, by hovering helicopters that fill the air with 'noise pollution' and by the 'light pollution' that makes it hard to see the stars at night (Nye 1994: 287). It is evident that nature in the Grand Canyon is not entirely as 'pristine' and unchanging as it is popularly understood to be. The Glen Canyon Dam alters much of the canyon's 'natural' character since it releases water at an even rate thereby slowing the erosion that had carved the canyon in the first place. This has caused a visual change, for the dam hampers the silt and rock that once would have been carried through the gorge and deposited upon its banks, as well as permitting the growth of dense foliage where it once would have been washed away by flooding (Nye 1994: 287-288). If the landscape itself, despite its protected status, has undergone alteration, changes have also occurred in the way that Americans have viewed the site over the last century.

Nowadays, the term 'sublime' tends to be used as a kind of generalised superlative epithet, whereas the nineteenth-century notion of the sublime had been rooted in a specific aesthetic discourse. Under capitalism the sublime has "been so watered down by commercial hype and tourist advertising that it retains only a dim echo of its former power" (Cronin 1995: 72). As a result, icons of the natural sublime increasingly came to be appreciated not in terms of nature’s immeasurable power and sublimity, but in contrast to a civilization that threatens to overwhelm (Nye 1994: 287). Whereas the Grand Canyon had in the past invited reflection on human insignificance, today the public generally sees this landscape through the cultural lens of those who live in a society where advanced technology is commonplace (Nye 1994: 289). Park Service employees report that characteristic questions by visitors reveal that they assume that the canyon was not created by natural forces, but by human intervention. Most commonly it is assumed that it was produced by one of the New Deal dam building programs or by native Indians, which is why a frequently asked question addressed to rangers is "What tools did they use?" (Nye 1994: 288). These assumptions reflect a climate in which the idea of human omnipotence has become so ubiquitous that many tourists perceive the natural world as an extension of humanity, rather than vice versa. For Nye this
reflects the assimilation of the natural and the technological sublime in the American mind in the late twentieth-century (Nye 1994: 289).

Since the early nineteenth-century the sublime has been one of America's defining ideals. Where Europe drew from centuries of history to create dominant symbols of strength and legitimacy, so the argument goes, New World symbols were vested in nature (Smith 1984: 7). For over two centuries the sublime persisted as the preferred American trope as Americans sought to establish their relationship to wild landscapes and, as the wilderness became tamed, the new technologies that wrought this change and showed America's dominion over nature. This schizoid appreciation of the awe-inspiring in nature and the awe-inspiring in technology Nye explains in terms of a national penchant for a distanced and rationalized projection of human will upon the environment. This may seem paradoxical, he says, but it is symptomatic of the process of capitalist development; fundamental changes in the landscape were simply part of civilisation’s progress that was regarded as inevitable and 'natural' (Nye 1994: 282).

The American wilderness and its association with the sublime has, it seems, long been infused with a sense of imminent demise, as insightful French observer of early America Alexis de Tocqueville writes in ‘A fortnight in the Wilds’ (1831):

> It is this consciousness of destruction, this *arriere-pensee* of quick and inevitable change that gives, we feel, a peculiar character and such a touching beauty to the solitudes of America. One sees them with melancholy pleasure; one is in some sort of a hurry to admire them. Thoughts of the savage, natural grandeur that is going to come to an end, become mingled with splendid anticipations of the triumphant march of civilisation. One feels proud to be a man, and at the same time one experiences I cannot say what bitter regret at the power that God has granted us over nature. One's soul is shaken by contradictory thoughts and feelings, but all the impressions it receives are great and leave a deep mark (Alexis de Tocqueville quoted in Bate 1991: 39)

Wilderness is afforded a touching beauty by the sense of its immanent destruction. Splendid anticipations of the triumphant march of civilisation are mingled passively with bitter regret at the inevitable. de Tocqueville here elaborates one of the main themes of my argument; how the natural sublime comes to be appreciated in contrast to a civilization that threatens to overwhelm (Nye 1994: 287).

The expansionist ideals of America and the unfolding drama of technological change are seen as interchangeable parts of the self-justifications of a national destiny. In the sublime we encounter a landscape aesthetic that linked a physical expanse to the expansiveness of the soul as a kind of ethos of 'Romantic nationalism'. However, the grand idea of the sublime in American landscape art was harnessed to the imperialist fantasy figured not only as God-ordained right but the inevitable teleology of a race "fitted for a spacious destiny", to use Coetzee’s phrase:
The spaciousness, grandeur and sublimity of American landscape art, and the linking of physical expanses with expansiveness of soul, feeds and is fed by the popular conviction that American space is the natural environment for a race fitted for a spacious destiny (Coetzee 1988: 58).

The sublime was projected onto the American landscape in a way that is a reflection of an ethos of progress and expansion (Coetzee 1988: 58). But the discourse of the sublime had a wider application under which religious, moral and nationalist concepts of nature were invoked that enabled the aggressive conquest of land as an “ideological necessity” (Smith 1984: 13). The United States expanded towards the Pacific ocean, eventually encompassing the entire continent from east to west. This mission was politically encapsulated in the term 'Manifest Destiny' which saw expansion as the ultimate design or purpose of the American race, both its indubitable and right and an inevitable or destined outcome of its territorial policies based on an assumed racial superiority. The dark side of this expansionist ideal was of course the seizure of native land for white cultivation and industry, the large-scale destruction of native peoples and the confinement of Indians to reservations. Moreover, it may be observed that the imperialist assumption of America’s 'spacious destiny' continues to resonate with latter-day global interventions and policies of that country.

America’s metaphorical ‘journey into the wilderness’ became synonymous with the advancing frontier where the landscape itself would produce a rugged and stalwart democracy and national character strongly associated with vigorous manhood. Cronin describes a classic academic version of the American frontier myth articulated by the historian Frederick Jackson Turner in 1893:

As Turner described the process, easterners and European immigrants, in moving to wild and unsettled lands of the frontier, shed the trappings of civilization, rediscovered their primitive racial energies, reinvented direct democratic institutions, and thereby reinfused themselves with a vigour, an independence, and a creativity that were the source of American democracy and national character. Seen in this way, wild country became a place not just of religious redemption but national renewal, the quintessential location for experiencing what it meant to be an American (Cronin 1995: 76).

The expanding American frontier was what Smith has called “the most utilitarian conquest known to history”. It came to be viewed as a kind of national ‘will to power’. It had to be legitimated on terms that were not “inspired by a calculus of rising land values and investments but (despite the orgies of speculation) as an immense exertion of the spirit” (Smith 1984: 13). In America the natural sublime and the frontier ideal had converged in way that carried the moral values and cultural symbols that continue to this day (Cronin 1995: 72). Because the rhetoric of the sublime was coupled to individualistic quest in the natural spaces as yet untouched by the polluting spread of industrialism, we also find a conceptualisation of wilderness that Cronin identifies as the “powerful attraction of primitivism” derived from Rousseau. The wilderness was the rhetorical ground that sustained the fantasy that one could return
to a simpler, more primitive way of life as an antidote to the ills of a civilized modern world (Cronin 1995: 76).

The transformation of wilderness in America was seen as no less than the fulfillment of national destiny, and as the wild landscape was transformed, new formations of the sublime were devised that were appropriate to a modernising and increasingly technological society (Nye 1994: xiv). Nye has argued that the sublime was not based on an opposition between nature and culture, and so did not reflect an absolute opposition between the natural and the technological sublime in Jacksonian America: "Americans looked for sublimity in both realms . . . Each provided a disruption of ordinary sense perception, and each was interpreted as a sign of national greatness" (Nye 1994: 282-283). Consequently, Nye has found the discourse of the sublime occurring persistently in not only in the face of natural scenes such as Niagara Falls, the Grand Canyon, the Natural Bridge of Virginia, but in the spectacle of technologies that provoked sensations of astonishment and awe such as the first railroads, suspension bridges, skyscrapers, spectacular lighting, electric advertising, world's fairs, atomic explosions and the rockets of the space programme (Nye 1994: 281-282).

In their enthusiasm for the technological sublime, Nye argues, Americans were different to Europeans who neither invented nor embraced the skyscraper, who banned or restricted electrical signs and who seldom journeyed to see rockets launch into space while Americans would go in their millions (Nye 1994: 282). But it is important to note that there were American dissenters such as Thoreau who suggested that the railroad, however admirable, exemplified a more general development in which technology, rather than humankind, was in control. Others felt that skyscrapers reduced the citizen to a featureless stick figure seen from a great distance (Nye 1994: 285). This opposition Nye interprets as a contradiction at the heart of the technological sublime “that invites the observer to interpret a sudden expansion of perceptual experience as the corollary to an expansion of human power, simultaneously evokes the sense of individual insignificance and powerlessness” (Nye 1994: 285).

Coetzee has declared that the sublime lends itself to the rhetoric of expansionism, while Mitchell has argued that ‘landscape’ is a conceptualisation tailor-made for discourses of imperialism:

[The] semiotic features of landscape, and the historical narratives they generate, are tailor-made for the discourse of imperialism, which conceives itself precisely (and simultaneously) as an expansion of “culture” and “civilization” into a “natural” space in a progress that itself is narrated as “natural”. Empires move outwards in space as a way of moving forwards in time; the “prospect” that opens up is not just a spatial scene but a projected future of ‘development’ and exploitation (Mitchell 1994: 17).

More specifically, it is the landscape aesthetic of the sublime that lends itself best to the rhetoric of expansion and progress, and as we see in America the sublime had a historical function in the formation
of a national identity that lies at the heart of the imperial project. The sublime was associated with exploration and imperial expansion, as we see from this seventeenth-century description of the 'masculine' sublime by Briton Adam Ferguson who is describing the glorious epoch when the New World was discovered. Those at the forefront of imperialist expansion were "like scouts gone abroad on the discovery of fertile lands [who] . . . "engage in every enterprise with the ardour of men, who believe they are going to arrive at national felicity, and permanent glory" (Ashfield and de Bolla 1996: 8). This description applies equally well not only to the penetration and conquest of the darkest continent by figures like Stanley and Livingston, but also to the ardour with which the British applied themselves to the transformation of East Africa, including the domestication of wilderness and the conversion of peoples from a state of 'wildness' to a state of ordered civilisation.

The landscape aesthetic of the sublime played a role in America's mythologised encounter with nature, but the sublime as a figure of thought seems to occur across a span of time and historical and cultural boundaries. What is apparent is that are many uses for the concept of the sublime, and we should therefore not expect that these should all should be compatible, homogenous or arising from the same source and in the same place. Certainly something of the idea of a 'spacious destiny' seems to exist in the ideals of the British Empire. Despite undeniable theological, cultural, and historical differences, a certain 'Romantic nationalism' is to be found in the grand rhetoric of these imperial regimes. This is not to say that the expansionist policies of America and Britain are the same, but to remark upon certain trans-national links that evolved out of the shared assumptions of the Age of Reason which included the legacy of disinterested observation derived from Francis Bacon and Descartes, a Judeo-Christian belief in humankind’s right of dominion over nature, and the influence of the new social sciences that posited the right of dominion over foreign lands and people. In British colonies the idea of the 'natural' superiority of the British race and the Darwinian concept of the survival of the fittest was used to legitimate the annexation or administration of the colonies and mandates in East Africa after 1860. Certainly this understanding was promoted by Lord Meath, (1841-1921) the founder of the Empire Day Movement in his book, Essays on Duty and Discipline: A Series of Papers:

The survival of the fittest is a doctrine which holds good in the political and social as well as the natural world. If the British race ceases to be worthy of dominion, it will cease to rule. Britons have ruled in the past because they were a virile race, brought up to obey, to suffer hardships cheerfully and to struggle victoriously (MacKenzie 1986: 129)

Here we find a constellation of themes that express the idea of the 'natural' superiority of the British race that, it was assumed, predisposed them to a national destiny of colonial conquest that was considered no less than an indubitable right. The civilizing mission gave a moral dimension to arguments for imperial expansion that would otherwise have been limited to acquisitive self-interest, strategic considerations and national pride. It gave credence to the belief that the interests of colonised peoples were what
motivated the colonizer, lending a humanistic mystique to the unsavoury aspect of annexation and domination of foreign territories (Adas 1989: 200). In the nineteenth-century, western commentators equated the advance of European colonization with the triumph of science and reason over forces of superstition and ignorance which they considered rampant in the non-industrialised world. The pagan worship of nature was construed as proof of an earlier stage of theological development, which provided the ideological motivation for missionaries, among the many foot soldiers of imperialism who were compelled to lead backward and superstition-bound peoples in the colonies to reason and Christian enlightenment (Adas 1989: 271). But perhaps the vigour with which such missionaries set about the task of remaking African societies owed as much to their sense of mechanical and scientific mastery as to their religious desire to convert the heathen (Adas 1989: 203). Without imperialist expansion and the application of western science and technology, it was argued, there was no hope of improving the condition of peoples who lived not only in material wretchedness but also in spiritual impoverishment (Adas 1989: 204).

Nye's book has followed a trend in recent scholarship that has revived a discourse thought "pretty much dead" (Weiskel 1976: 5). Among those that have reinterpreted the sublime in the contemporary context are theorists like Lyotard, who has reinvigorated the sublime in his interpretation of non-representational painting as being "witness to the unrepresentable" (Lyotard: 1994: 125). And postmodern theorist Andreas Huyssen has asked in response, "what would be more sublime and unrepresentable than the nuclear holocaust, the bomb being signifier of the ultimate sublime" (Huyssen 1992: 341). This invocation of the sublime suggests that it could be used to describe an encounter with a radical alterity that remains inassimilable to representation (Freeman 1995: 11). A discussion of the sublime in these varying contexts is significant in that it contemporises and politicises the term, effectively unharnessing the term of the sublime from its European origins in the great debates of England and Germany in the eighteenth and nineteenth-century, and reinvigorating the concept in the contemporary age. Indeed, Nye argues that the history of the concept from antiquity onwards shows that objects and interpretations of the sublime vary not only from one epoch to another and from one culture to another but also from one discipline to another. He argues, rather reductively perhaps, that in essence the sublime “refers to an immutable capacity of human psychology for astonishment” that shows both the objects that arouse this feeling and their interpretations to be socially constructed (Nye 1994: 3). By tracing the emergence of the sublime in nature and technology over the past two centuries within American public life, Nye shows that it served as an element of social cohesion where sites of the natural or technological sublime facilitate performative rites of national solidarity. Nye’s book proposes that the sublime in modern day America has become de-intellectualised, ‘democratised’, multicultural and participatory, where "the millions who travel to the Grand Canyon or Cape Canaveral can share an awed response to what they see without discussing or even articulating what their sublime encounter means" (Nye 1994: xiv).
Nye infers that the sublime is not necessarily confined only to the American psyche when he says: "In a physical world that is increasingly desacrilised, the sublime represents a way to reinvest the landscape and the works of men with transcendental significance" (Nye 1994: xiv). A regard for the natural sublime can be understood to be symptomatic of the broader social formation of capitalism, and informs western contemporary consciousness in various ways. This is a theme that Mitchell touches on when he proposes that landscape has become threatened to the point that it has become the object of protection.

Landscape, or that land invested with ‘poetic’ significance, is under threat because of its fundamental link to 'natural' spaces that are menaced by capitalist expansion:

Landscape is now more precious than ever -- an endangered species that has to be protected from and by civilization, kept safe in museums, parks, and shrinking "wilderness areas". Like imperialism itself, landscape is an object of nostalgia in a postcolonial and postmodern era, reflecting a time when metropolitan cultures could imagine their destiny in an unbounded 'prospect' of endless appropriation and conquest (Mitchell 1994: 20).

The point is that the unbounded prospect of untamed nature was subject to, even 'invited,' imperialist expansion, the ultimate effect of which was its domestication and control through commodification and enclosure. Nye has indicated some of the modern uses of the sublime in the increasingly technological society of the United States, and what has been most useful to my project is that aspect of his argument that sees the ideas of the natural sublime as occurring in tandem with technology and the rapid transformation of the landscape.

Cronin (and other scholars of the history of environmentalism) have suggested that the modern environmental movement in America is itself the 'grandchild' of Romanticism and American post-frontier ideology, which explains why "so much environmentalist discourse takes its bearings from the wilderness ideal that these intellectual movements created" (Cronin 1995: 72). According to Cronin, environmentalism, often in the form of a preservationist response to capitalist development, holds 'pristine' wilderness landscape in highest regard. It is this regard for untouched wilderness that environmentalism seems to draw upon the Romantic ideal.

For many Americans wilderness stands as the last remaining place where civilisation, that all too human disease, has not fully infected the earth. It is an island in the polluted sea of urban-industrial modernity, the one place we can turn for escape from our own too-muchness. Seen in this way, wilderness presents itself as the best antidote to our human selves, a refuge we must somehow recover if we hope to save the planet. As [Henry] David Thoreau once famously declared, "In Wildness is the preservation of the World" (Cronin 1995: 69).

Today, in a constricted and structured world, where ‘natural’ landscapes are conceived as rarified, even endangered, spaces, we have become "too ironic for the capacious gestures of the Romantic sublime" (Weiskel 1976: 6). Instead, this type of landscape is the object of nostalgia that is largely confined museums, parks and wilderness preserves.
It is against [the] sense of an increasingly constricted and structured world that the ideology of the sublime looms up retrospectively, as a moribund aesthetic (Weiskel 1976: 6).

The idea of the sublime as a retrospective aesthetic in the climate of capitalism is one of the fundamental contentions of this investigation, and one that I will be exploring in more detail in my later discussions of the burgeoning capitalism of the colonial states of Tanzania.

The exemplary landscape of the Romantic sensibility was wilderness. Wilderness in turn was the object of the discourse of the natural sublime associated with vast open spaces and unbounded prospects. With natural environments becoming increasingly commodified and 'civilised', the possibility of escape from one's own constricted circumstances becomes vastly reduced. For this reason Weiskel suggests that the sublime has become abridged and parodied in the present day:

To pleasure us, the sublime must now be abridged, reduced, and parodied as the grotesque, somehow hedged . . . The infinite spaces are no longer astonishing; still less do they terrify. They pique our curiosity, but we have lost the obsession, so fundamental to the Romantic sublime, with natural infinitude. We live once again in a finite natural word whose limits are beginning to press against us . . . We hear in the background of the Romantic sublime the grand confidence of a heady imperialism, now superattenuated as ethic or state of mind – a kind of spiritual capitalism, enjoining a pursuit of the infinitude of the private self (Weiskel 1976: 6).

In an echo of Cosgrove’s critique of the Romantic tradition outlined earlier in this chapter, Weiskel suggests that the sublime, with its overtones of heady imperialism, embodies a kind of ‘spiritual capitalism’ that celebrates ‘naturalness’ of the individual. Perhaps what is more significant here is that he acknowledges the philosophical and aesthetic link between the Romantic sublime and the imperialist impulse.

In East Africa an ethos emerged that associated wild landscapes with social and cultural practices of European hunting and safari which were enacted in the ‘primitive vastness’ of Kenya, Uganda and Tanganyika during colonial rule. For most this experience of the wilds was about the assertion of dominion over nature. But there were some who laid down their guns and went into the wilderness in search of something else – the spirit of the ‘blue’ and the unity of all things, including man and beast, in the curing, guiding and restoring wilderness. In 1927 Jan Christiaan Smuts wrote in his treatise on holism of the silent sympathy and communion that can be found in African nature:

For the overwrought mind there is no peace like Nature’s, for the wounded spirit there is no healing like hers. There are indeed times when human companionship becomes unbearable, and we fly to Nature for that silent sympathy and communion which she alone can give. Some of the deepest emotional experiences of my life have come to me on the many nights I have spent under the open African sky; and I am sure my case has not been singular in this respect (Smuts 1927:336-337).
Smuts, who invented the term ‘holism’, was certainly not alone in this respect, and I will go on to explore Romantic conceptualisations of the ‘consoling wilds’ and the emotional experiences to be had “under the open African sky” in the chapter, ‘The Inverted Landscape’. Here I argue that the spectacular wild landscapes could easily allow for a sublime encounter with wild nature – one has only to think of the scenery of the Great Rift Valley, or the migrating herds on the Serengeti. It is quite feasible that on the northern tourist circuit of Tanzania Europeans could quite easily share, in the face of the natural sublime, “an awed response to what they see without discussing or even articulating what their sublime encounter means” (Nye 1994: xiiv).

Drawing on the writings of Cosgrove and Mitchell it is clear that that the primitivist desire for the pre-industrial landscape is inextricably linked to the rise of industrial capitalism. It may be said that, in an increasingly desacrilised physical world where wild nature has largely been confined to wilderness preserves, the quest for the sublime represented a way to reinvest the landscape with transcendental significance. It is my argument that wilderness spaces that have become the pre-eminent sites for the nostalgic recreations of the Romantic sublime. This is why the value of wild landscape lies beyond the practical function of preserving that which is sacrificed to commerce and development everywhere else. Wilderness is the landscape type that has come to embody the spiritual and the imaginative within the western landscape tradition.
CHAPTER 2: Territories of Production, Reproduction and Imagination

The Logical Economy of Imperialism and the Imagined State of Nature

Expansionist imperialism was the historical force that imposed the abstract ‘logic’ of capital on distant lands. Land in the colonies may have been the formal precondition for systems of production, but they quickly became the territory of the imperialist imagination. Or, as Mitchell has put it, the semiotic features of colonial landscapes allowed imperialism to conceive of itself “as an expansion of “culture” and “civilization” into a “natural” space in a progress that itself is narrated as “natural”” (Mitchell 1994: 17). Broadly speaking, the exertion of control over wilderness through cultivation, settlement and industry, and the recasting of that environment in the image of imperial order were seen as the triumph of European endeavour, science and reason over indigenous idleness, superstition and ignorance. In other words, Europe had a kind of reciprocal dependence on subordinated ‘nature’ which in turn would allow the articulation of its own cultural, political, social, scientific, militaristic and religious pre-eminence.

The spatial relations between wilderness and cultivation reproduced the conceptual boundaries between savagery and civilization that were fundamental to the maintenance of a white European national identity in the colonies. According to Marzec, the experience of land as either ‘frightful’ or 'incorporated' has informed the logical economy of imperialism at its core. He has identified the act of enclosure as an ontological, cultural, socio-political and environmental discourse of imperial representation and identity formation (Marzec 2002:137). Unenclosed land, in his view, has 'within it' a "hidden element that, if not vigilantly contained by this discursive device, would lead to the national subject's monstrous transmutation into the foreign Other" (Marzec 2002:139). The opposition between 'wildness' and 'order', both symbolic and corporeal, underpin western teleological narratives of identity formation in the colony.

‘Wilderness’ and ‘wildness’ operate as signifiers of difference that were used to support ideas of racial dominance, which is why one of the key narratives of colonialist development has been the story of Africa ‘tamed’ and domesticated. The boundary between savagery and civilization was policed by discourses of racial difference in ethnology and in Lamarckian, polygenist and evolutionist debates which were based upon the essential idea of bloodlines, lineage and kinship (Haraway 1995: 338). According to Stoler, the ordering of colonial identity engaged class, race and sex defined what it meant to a productive member of the European nation. These social divisions were not only the exclusionary principles with which the legitimating rhetoric of European civility sought to contain the colonial other, but the discourses of difference with which it sought to secure a susceptible European self. A collective European identity was threatened, clarified and defended through individuated 'interior frontiers' of self-restraint, self-discipline.
and a managed sexuality (Stoler 1995: 177-178). The exclusionary politics of racial difference may have emphasised individual restraint and control as the defining essence of national civility, but the enclosure of land sought to impose an imperial order upon the exterior realm as the domestication of wilderness transformed ‘wastelands’ of African wilderness into cultivated settlement. In this way, the boundary between tame and untamed, savage and civilized, wilderness and cultivation was the crucial rhetorical and representational device that came to govern the both the conceptual and topographical terrains of the colonial state.

The idea of wilderness became reformulated in the tropics within an imaginative ideal derived from Europe; namely that nature be completely 'natural', that is, untamed and untouched, pristine and purifying. Africa, with its vast wilderness areas had long been imagined as somehow 'behind' time and therefore outside of the modern maelstrom that plagued the 'civilised' world. But while the Romantic idea of nature did become transposed and transformed in the context of East African wilderness landscapes of the twentieth-century, it came to exist in conjunction with another, far older conceptualization of Africa as 'parent of everything that is monstrous' - threatening and excessive natural forms, strange animals and mysterious cultures (McClintock 1995: 22). Africa's tropical intemperance had long been subject to the inflamed imaginings of those who lived in more moderate climes and as such was at once the locus of European abhorrence and desire. Africa was both feared and longed-for; it was the quintessential space of aberration and adventure. It drew the traveller as it repelled him - valleys darkened with fecund vegetation, sulphurous lakes that turned the traveller away unrefreshed, volcanoes rising vertically from plains teeming with prehistoric-looking wild animals and populated with primitive peoples. And yet it was the vision of 'Africa untamed' that provided the rhetorical ground on which a sense of personal and national history could be acted out (Comaroff 1991: 86).

The idea of wild Africa intersects with a deeply embedded core myth of the Judeo-Christian tradition – Eden. Equatorial Africa especially was from the earliest times an acknowledged site of a prodigious and intemperate nature which included extraordinary vegetation, prehistoric looking animals and primordial landscape formations, as McClintock has argued. As such it lent itself to the European grand narratives of fall and recovery - including the longing for a perfect past or deep fears about continuing loss - that intersect with the Genesis account in a variety of ways. On the one hand, wilderness ‘untouched’ presupposes an ‘original’ and timeless state of harmony and perfection in which human beings live at one with a divinely created nature. In this conceptualisation, wilderness is a space wherein one could regain original state of innocence through a return to nature. On the other, the fall from grace which resulted in exile from the Garden of Eden imposed upon human beings the necessity of labour and which robbed them of their original mastery over nature (Slater 1995: 116). ‘Paradise Lost’ is countered by a recovery narrative in which the earth could be transformed into an idyllic, cultivated garden where humanity has
regained mastery over all of nature through human endeavor. Merchant has identified this impulse particularly with the colonial context when she remarks that “colonists, aided by Christian doctrine of redemption and the tools of science, technology, and capitalism (“arte and industrie”), have undertaken to reinvent the whole earth in the image of the Garden of Eden (Merchant 1995: 134). This is perhaps most succinctly expressed in a poem that I will go on to examine by poet laureate of the British Empire, Rudyard Kipling.

The Explorer (1898) is a poem that demonstrates how the wilderness of the colony was the discursive device that enabled the potent fusion of physical geography and cultural myth. Although Kipling’s Orientalism has mainly been discussed with regard to India, the paradoxical relation between wilderness and capitalist imperialism that occurs in this poem can be seen as pertinent to the colonial conquests of the British Empire as a whole. The relation between the personal and national endeavor and the physical terrain of the colony formed in the mind of the British imperialist what we could call, after Leo Marx’s 1964 study of the contradictory celebration of wild nature and new technology in America, a kind of ‘moral geography’ (Smith 1984: 7).

As discussed in the previous chapter, imperialism has drawn its foundational narratives and symbols from the dialectical image of wild and tamed nature. Imperialist exploration and travel narratives feature land in the colonies as an adversarial or “volatile entity that must be subordinated by the West” (Marzec 2002:137). At the same time, wilderness tamed expresses the civilizing artistry of an individual and national domination of ‘wildness’, as Marzec has identified in relation to canonical literature of the likes of Defoe’s Robinson Crusoe, Conrad’s Heart of Darkness, Kipling’s Kim and E.M. Forster’s Passage to India and Howards End:

The colonialist/imperial opposition between a self who is governed by the unruly nomadic impulse and one who has domesticated this impulse by becoming an agriculturalist (settler) is a structural imperative of Western teleological narratives of identity formation: The movement of nomadic desire must come under control through the commodification of that desire in a colonial apparatus. The specific form of that commodification is the enclosure act – the grounding of a previously open subjectivity in a fabricated (colonized) land (Marzec 2002:132).

Kipling’s poem is one such foundational narrative of the British Empire. However, Kipling presents this origin story in such a way as to show the inherent contradictions that underlie the mythical precepts of the nomadic impulse and the ‘inevitable’ and God-ordained destiny of development and commerce that follows, as a close reading will reveal. It is a poem that expresses on the one hand an unquenchable longing for wilderness and on the other the inevitable consequences of that desire. For these reasons I will quote the poem with my commentary included. The poem begins with the idea that something is lost and can be recovered:
Till a voice, as bad as Conscience, rang interminable changes
On one everlasting Whisper day and night repeated—so:
"Something hidden. Go and find it. Go and look behind the Ranges—
"Something lost behind the Ranges. Lost and waiting for you. Go!"

What lies beyond the settlement in the small foothills at the edge of unexplored wilderness seems to whisper to the explorer of something once known and now lost that is waiting for his discovery. This is the call of the wilderness; it is as though the boundless space of the rugged beyond itself beckons endlessly.

"There's no sense in going further—it's the edge of cultivation,"
So they said, and I believed it—broke my land and sowed my crop—
Built my barns and strung my fences in the little border station
Tucked away below the foothills where the trails run out and stop:

So I went, worn out of patience; never told my nearest neighbours—
Stole away with pack and ponies—left 'em drinking in the town;
And the faith that moveth mountains didn't seem to help my labours
As I faced the sheer main-ranges, whipping up and leading down.

Exploration here is exacted at the expense of convention. He, (for it is without a doubt a masculine protagonist), must 'steal away' from civilization in order to fulfill his personal destiny, leaving behind not only the small-minded misgivings of others, but also his corner of cultivation and strike out alone towards an uncertain and potentially interminable goal. It is a journey that will challenge his conviction, and by implication his faith in God, for although “faith moves mountains” it is he who will have to take each painful and dangerous step of the journey over the hostile terrain. In comparison with the battle over the mountains, the valley lies before the explorer in ready acquiescence. But upon descending the mountains, he does not pause to take in the view in a pleasurable or aesthetic sense, but presses on.

Up along the hostile mountains, where the hair-poised snowslide shivers—
Down and through the big fat marshes that the virgin ore-bed stains,
Till I heard the mile-wide mutterings of unimagined rivers,
And beyond the nameless timber saw illimitable plains!

'Plotted sites of future cities, traced the easy grades between 'em;
Watched unharnessed rapids wasting fifty thousand head an hour;
Counted leagues of water-frontage through the axe-ripe woods that screen 'em—
Saw the plant to feed a people--up and waiting for the power!

This is no romantic ramble or comfortable excursion for the cultivated consumption of nature, but an expedition in to uncover the hidden value of this new found land. The purpose of the expedition is revealed by the way in which the invisible ore-bed is beneath the marsh is 'seen' and the trees described as ready-to-use 'timber'. The landscape is not taken in as one would in an attitude of contemplative repose, but actively produced by the eye that encompasses it. Scholars have commented that the ability to envision enclosure, cultivation and settlement becomes "the saving grace, that which will mark the
difference between civilized zeal and a savage rambling” (Marzec 2002:143). Here the zeal of civilization is taken to its logical extreme; the valley is not conceived of as a place where picturesque agrarian settlement could take hold, but mapped within a far more ambitious scheme of socio-economic possibility. Future cities are ‘plotted’ to rise up on sites suitably graded or contoured, and the more commercially useful land at the river-front is accounted for in units of distance measured as leagues. The river’s rapids will be harnessed for hydraulic power to drive the industries that will spring up on its shores fed by burgeoning commercial development founded on “axe-ripe” forests and the ‘virgin ore-bed’.

In this poem the sensibility of the Romantic sublime frequently associated with the unbounded view of ‘illimitable plains’ is missing; the expansive view does not transport the explorer into a reverie of visual delight, but moves him rather to the acquisitive contemplation of future possibility. The poetics of the prospect are subordinated to the disinterested and reasoned objectification of the natural landscape in terms of its use-value. It is an ‘enclosing eye’ which scans the landscape, cognitively mapping the possibilities of a Euro-colonial future, as Pratt has argued:

The eye scanning prospects in the spatial sense knows itself to be looking at prospects in the temporal sense – possibilities of a Eurocolonial future coded as resources to be developed, surpluses to be traded, towns to be built (Pratt 1992: 61).

The explorer’s encounter with the landscape in this poem does not imply the economic potential of the land through a process of aesthetic visualization; it seizes the land in a gaze of organization and control. The ‘enclosing eye’ of the explorer imposes spatial order upon the ‘illimitable plains’ as a form of possessive signification. The cairns, marks and bearings of the explorer’s journey might bring others in the explorer’s footsteps, but it will be his representation of the landscape in the form of the witness account of its economic potential that will bring about the occupation and transformation of the land. As Greenblatt has written of the conquest of America, “the European dream of possession rests on witnessing understood as a form of significant and representative seeing” (Greenblatt 1991:122).

Although Kipling’s explorer has projected an image of intent upon the land, and gazes with a proprietary interest at a landscape envisaged in terms of commercial development, he goes on to denounce his own material reward. He claims that his compunction to explore and discover is not motivated by personal avarice or the desire for wealth or recognition, and in doing so, disavows his own place in the scene. This suggests that we should read the poem not as a process of envisioning where the protagonist projects himself into the urban-industrial landscape scene he has imagined, but rather as a process in which the landscape is envisaged in terms derived from a broader western teleological framework. It is, in other words, it is projection of the landscape ideal that is not only expressive of a British national identity, but also of the western socio-economic formation of capitalism.
They will find my sites of townships--not the cities that I set there.
They will rediscover rivers--not my rivers heard at night.
By my own old marks and bearings they will show me how to get there,
By the lonely cairns I builded they will guide my feet aright.

Have I named one single river? Have I claimed one single acre?
Have I kept one single nugget--(barring samples)? No, not I!
Because my price was paid me ten times over by my Maker.
But you wouldn't understand it. You go up and occupy.

Ores you'll find there; wood and cattle; water-transit sure and steady
(That should keep the railway-rates down), coal and iron at your doors.
God took care to hide that country till He judged His people ready,
Then He chose me for His Whisper, and I've found it, and it's yours!

The Explorer is a poem that elaborates the theme of loss and recovery in the context of the expansion of the British Empire. Yet as the narrative unfolds we understand that the protagonist has follows the whisper to explore “behind the Ranges” but does not find, as the Romantic poet would, an original state of innocence in nature. This is indeed a natural ‘paradise’ of sorts, but it is one envisioned within the progressive ethos of industrial capitalism where an inert nature will be transformed into the raw materials for colonial enterprise.

And yet the explorer goes on to renounce his right to name and thereby claim legal title to the land. He declares that he has not undertaken to name even a single river, suggesting that he has left to others the task of imposing the order he has envisaged over the disordered and chaotic wilderness. His recompense, he says instead, is “paid me ten times over by my Maker” as a kind of spiritual ‘remuneration’. We can discern a hint of satire in Kipling’s characterization in which the explorer has unwittingly vulgarised the lofty spiritual ideals expressed here by metaphorically attaching a quantity to the Unquantifiable. Perhaps the crassness of metaphor and coarseness of language is Kipling’s way of disarming the grand rhetoric of Empire and exposing its ‘real’ motivations by using the plain-speaking language of the common man.

The poem is an ‘origin’ story of a God-ordained imperialist capitalism which will transform an undeveloped nature into a state not only of civility and order, but of economic return. The land might have been bestowed by divine grace, but it requires a particular vision to realize the potential plenty that lies in wait. The ore in the mine, timber unfelled and rapids unharnessed are seen as resources to be converted by the power of human labour and technology into commodities of enterprise. Wilderness is the frontier that capitalism continually pushes back through exploration. The picturesque scene of colonial homesteads momentarily conjured by the phrase “wood and cattle” is immediately dispelled as the poem moves rapidly towards a particularly urban-industrial vision that converts the natural features of the landscape into assets of the socio-economic terrain. Water-transit will keep railway-rates down for the mercenary adventurers who will come in the wake of the traveller to “occupy”; it is they who will
build the export-based colonial economy he has envisaged. River and rail will be the life blood of
merchants, speculators, tradesman, traffickers and tycoons who will ship the plentiful ore, coal, iron and
wood towards the metropole. The use-value of the land he has envisaged will soon be transformed by
others into exchange-value.

The capitalist-industrialist perspective that the poem imposes upon the wild and natural place that the
explorer has discovered, Kipling tells us, is the dream landscape of God-given plenty:

Yes, your "Never-never country"—yes, your "edge of cultivation"
And "no sense in going further"—till I crossed the range to see.
God forgive me! No, I didn’t. It’s God’s present to our nation.
Anybody might have found it, but--His Whisper came to Me!

The poem illustrates a foundational myth of the imperialist enterprise in which remote regions are seized
as “God’s present to our nation”. Exploration in this poem is figured as a quasi-religious pilgrimage to a
land of commercial ‘milk and honey’ in which the country has ‘hidden’ from prior occupation until ‘His
people’ were ready to claim it for their own. However, there is a hint of the burlesque in the
characterization of the explorer who glories in his discovery and then, correcting himself, “God forgive
me!” attributes the discovery to God as His gift to the nation. This ‘slip’ echoes the indelicate prose found
earlier in the poem, including the vulgar idea that God has ‘paid’ explorer-protagonist ten times over as
reward for his endeavors. In this way Kipling subtly debunks the elevated spiritual ideals that the explorer
has attached as motivation for his journey and subsequent discovery, and in doing so, somewhat unhinges
the narrative from its grandiose proclamations. Part of this strategy is the blunt utilitarianism of Kipling’s
prose which pays scant regard to the romantic description of landscape. This is no doubt in keeping with
the working class characterization of the explorer, who ignores the aesthetics of landscape gets directly
on with the ‘business’ of Empire. But it leads me to suspect that Kipling might have intended the "Never-
ever country" of the newly discovered colonial outpost figured as a ‘dream’ landscape of industrial
capitalism to cause those of cultivated mind and refined sensibility to recoil. Let me go on to explain why I
think this is so.

To the Romantic mind, wild nature was the material manifestation of metaphysical meaning. Natural
objects in themselves were declarations of the presence of divinity where, in Ruskin’s landscape aesthetic,
one could find ‘sermons in stones’. The natural world conveyed a deeper spiritual meaning which close
observation would reveal in all its perfection. For Ruskin unity and order was etched into nature by the
creator, and could be found in the curvature of a slope repeated in the line of a bird’s wing and again in
the shape of a twig or the edge of a leaf (Cosgrove 1984: 247). These recurrent shapes and forms revealed
no less than an anatomy of divine creation. Nature stood as testament not only to the order and unity of
the universe but to the phenomenal presence of God in nature. But in Kipling’s poem nature is simply the
raw material from which society is built (Smith 1984: 2). It is seen as material rather than spiritual; natural phenomena like rivers and ore-beds may be God-given but their value is very much man-made. In Kipling’s fin-de-siècle account of colonial development, capitalist progress is none other than the process by which wild nature is conquered and subdued. But to the Romantic this would of necessity also subdue the God that resides in that nature – what Smith calls “an unacceptable blasphemy” (Smith 1984: 12). Here we find the crux of the conceptual schism that posits pristine nature as incorrupt and nature conquered as ‘fallen’.

Merchant has argued, however, that this position is expediently recouped by an Edenic recovery narrative in which society is created in the image of a garden. In the pastoral ideal of the humanized earth a harmonious balance between ‘man and nature’ could be repossessed through by the application of ‘mechanical arts’ and the ‘inquisition of nature’ (scientific enquiry). This is a kind of conceptual middle-ground in as Smith describes:

Increasingly the God-centred Edenic vision of nature was edged aside by a more anthropocentric vision. If the original wilderness was a garden gifted by God, the new humanized garden was, for some, mankind’s attempt to smooth the corners of nature into a more harmonious unity. The universality of nature was preserved in the pastoral ideal; the human figures and their artifacts loomed larger in the landscape while the divine light was softened (Smith 1984: 12).

In Kipling’s poem the recovery narrative – ‘something lost behind the ranges’ - is a divine calling to colonial exploration, whose reward, abundant nature, is gifted by God. But the outcome of this journey is imaged as a picturesque garden where man enacts a beneficent domination over nature in terms of the pastoral ideal. Instead, whole cities rise up, ore-beds are plundered and water seized for the hydraulics of industry. The machine has invaded the garden.

In the colonial context, the machine invading the garden was the gun. It opened the way for pioneer hunters and explorers, fed the soldiers of the East Africa campaigns, sustained settler farmers over difficult periods and brought much-needed revenue from hunting licenses state coffers over decades of safari. The gun was quickly supported by technologies of mechanised transport – railway, trucks, motorcars and airplanes - that provided hunters with ever quicker and easier access to remote regions of the East African interior.4

---

4 As the Chief Game Warden of Kenya would observe in 1925, “No aspect of civilization has more increased the complexity of game conservation problems than the advent into general use of motor-cars” (Steinhart 2006: 144).
Who were these hunters? According to Steinhart they were European administrators and settlers, aristocrats and gentlemen, ladies, scientists and ethnologists, farmers, missionaries, First World advisors and last but not least, travellers and tourists, including royalty, presidents, authors, film stars and anyone else who wanted to ‘have a go’ at African game, as J.A. Hunter once put it. In short, hunting may have been an elitist sport that was avidly pursued by European settler communities, but it was also a pastime of international proportion. No wonder conservationists of the earlier part of the century aimed their concerns about diminishing game specifically at European hunters who in turn blamed African ‘poachers’.

For the upper-classes of Europe, upon whose landed estates one could at best bag a stag or boar, East Africa was a hunter’s paradise. Here they were able to indulge, to a degree not even possible on the great estates of Central Europe, their desire for ritualized slaughter as a test of chivalry, endurance, and manhood (Cannadine 1990: 374).

In Kenya it had been the lure of abundant big game had presented an ideal opportunity to impoverished and adventurous patricians such as Bertram Francis Gurdon, who subsequently became second Lord Cranworth. He arrived in Kenya in 1902, drawn there “by love of sport, more especially big game shooting, and shortage of cash” (Cannadine 1990: 438). By 1912 Cranworth had published A colony in the Making which depicted Kenya as the ideal home for emigrants of noble lineage (Cannadine 1990: 439). In 1907 he had already established a large farm in the Thika district to the north of Nairobi at Makuyu, where he fenced off the land for farming and grazing. To facilitate the requirements of farming, and unrestricted by shooting limits on his own land, he was able to completely clear this land of wildlife and transform the landscape from wilderness into a vision of agrarian economy. In 1939 he would write “Today the house is surrounded by tens of thousands of acres of blue-green sisal and dark green coffee, not a buck or zebra is left upon the remnant of the plain” (Steinhart 2006: 98-99). Reminiscing over this accomplishment Cranworth recalls that it had been years before they were troubled with a butcher’s bill at Makuyu: “There were buck and variety in abundance,” he says, “indeed, at the roughest estimates, I put the number on our estate in the region of 14,000” (Cranworth quoted by Steinhart 2006: 98).

Cranworth became a leading member of Kenya’s settler elite in the period before the Great War, along with Lord Cardoss, a poor Scottish peer, and the brothers Berkely and Galbraith Cole, younger sons of the Earl of Enniskillen. Most influential of all Kenya’s pre-war settlers, however, was the third Lord Delamere. He was characterised as being arrogant, reckless, overbearing, quick-tempered, and sarcastic and was
known to have enjoyed the pleasures of the hunt to excess (Cannadine 1990: 439-440). Delamere’s decision to settle in Kenya, it is said, had far more to do with his hunting ambitions than with his interest in farming (Steinhart 2006: 95). He first went to Kenya on a shooting safari in 1898, and in 1903 obtained a land grant for 100,000 acres. The purchase of this land cost him his inherited estate in Cheshire which, already encumbered by debt, passed into the hands of receivers. With no experience of farming, and unaware of local conditions and diseases, Delamere tried sheep, wheat and tobacco but all failed (Cannadine 1990: 439-440).

Delamere became the foremost spokesperson for the settler community in Kenya, and his role as a model hunter, landowner, political figure, and socialite cannot be overstated (Steinhart 2006: 96). Paradoxically, by mid-century Dalmere’s reputation as a conservationist was so entrenched that the 1949 draft history of the Kenya National Parks paid the following tribute to him as key conservator in early Kenya:

Due entirely to the foresight of Lord Delamere, two Game Reserves were established in British East Africa in 1900. As further evidence of his lifelong conservationist principles, he would convert his farm at Soysambu in the Rift Valley to a game preserve (Quoted in Steinhart 2006: 956).

Delamere’s biographer Elspeth Huxley claimed that his keen interest in game preservation began as early as 1900, when his concern over the decimation of elephants would lead him to recommend to the Foreign Office’s representative in East Africa, Sir Harry Johnston, that there should be a game reserve created in the Baringo district of the Rift Valley. Delamere’s claim to conservation in this area has been compromised by recent evidence in which the same Sir Harry Johnston stated that Delamere had shot elephant with a maxim-gun (an early machine-gun) in Baringo for the purposes of collecting ivory for sale (Steinhart 2006: 95):

The fact is Lord Delamere, who secured 14,000 of ivory in the Baringo district by shooting elephant with a maxim gun, was exceedingly annoyed on returning to his old hunting ground to find that I had created Baringo Game Reserve which was intended to preserve elephants . . . until such time as we were able to establish a station to control so-called sportsmen (Steinhart 2006: 95 Quoting Johnston to Sclater 6 March 1900)

Steinhart considers Johnston’s account reliable, and he sees this incident as representative of Delamere’s ruthless approach to suppressing and destroying wildlife game when it came to questions of personal financial interests or his views of progress (Steinhart 2006: 956). Delamere was by no means alone in shooting elephant to supplement an uncertain income to be derived from farming. Other pre-war emigrants like Cranworth, and Denys Finch-Hatton, a member of the impoverished Winchilsea clan, being short of cash would engage in the commercial trade of animal products, especially ivory which at that time was fetching somewhere about twenty five shillings a pound (Steinhart 2006: 99).
A crucial distinction was made between the hunting for sport, that is, as a pursuit of perfect head of game or trophy, and hunting basely motivated by consumption, commerce and profit. In the early years of the advance of European conquest, “the gun became a vital part of the payroll”, and wild meat was used to supplement the wages of pioneers, soldiers, prospectors and settlers (Mackenzie 1987: 42). The gun opened up the continent because it supplied early frontiersmen and white hunters with food, but because wild meat was the customary fare of natives and was commonly available, the venison of Africa was not associated with the refined repasts of the landed estate of Europe. Instead, it was associated with a heroic conception of the virile and hard-living frontiersman who knew the African bush and who could ‘live off the land’. Nevertheless, hunting out of necessity formed the basis of many derogatory class and race stereotypes. For instance, Afrikaners were frequently disparaged as ‘biltong hunters’, that is, men motivated to kill by the base requirements of food and profit. The idea that men of the British peerage who were highly esteemed as sportsmen and gentlemen among the settler community like Delamere, Cranworth and Finch-Hatton were taking part in ‘unsporting’ commercial hunting might have tarnished their reputations. However there did exist, in small measure at least, an understanding among settlers that killing wildlife out of financial necessity pretty much ‘came with the territory’.

Elspeth Huxley, who famously recounted her childhood memories of the Kenyan highlands in *The Flame Trees of Thika*, comments that settlers considered wild animals to be as much part of the landscape as its inanimate features. For this reason, they were regarded as an ‘inexhaustable’ resource:

In this now vanished world, the animals seemed inexhaustible, as much a permanent part of the landscape as rivers or trees. It occurred to very few of us that in our lifetime the animals, like the forests that are felled and the rivers that run dry, would dwindle to a shadow of their former abundance and, over most of these seemingly limitless highlands, simply disappear (Huxley in Ofcansky 2002: xi).

The Kenyan highlands of Huxley’s childhood are now a ‘vanished world’, Huxley tells us. The wild animals that had once roamed the plains in abundance simply disappeared over the course of a single lifetime. In his proposal that it be made into a national park in 1931, Kenya’s Game Warden Arthur Ritchie had described the ‘limitless highlands’ of the Nairobi commonage as “one of the most remarkable pieces of game country in the world” (Ofcansky 2002: 85). The East African Highlands had supported spectacular concentrations of wild life that formed the Athi-Kapiti ecosystem - the second largest migrating population of zebra and wildebeest in East Africa. Already in 1908, however, the Athi plains were said to have so many visiting sportsmen that one was more likely to be hurt by a bullet than by a lion (Cameron 1990: 61). Still in 1950 a *National Geographic* article describing ‘Africa’s Unfenced Zoos’ tells the reader that one doesn’t necessarily have to go to the expense of a safari to see wild animals, for in Nairobi you can see wild animals for the price of a taxi fare to the nearby plains:
All you need to do is drive just outside town. Few other cities in the world can boast such a convenient open ‘zoo’. I cannot call it unfenced for it does have one, although it encloses nothing. A short straight length of fencing has been put up to keep the wildlife on the plain from wandering onto runways of the local airport or into town. But some animals still walk around it (Moore 1950: 355-356)

When the National Parks Ordinance of 1945 set aside large areas of Kenya for the exclusive use of wildlife the Nairobi National Park was the first to be declared in 1946 in recognition it its importance as a dry-season feeding ground for migrating herds. In the colonial era, the functional relationships between national parks and areas within an ecosystem were often not taken into account with the result that many parks were concentration areas for migrating wildlife populations which were in effect only the small parts of much larger ecosystems. Nairobi National Park was one such example where most animals continued to use areas under human occupation for part of their seasonal cycles (Prins & Grootenhuis 2000: 141). The park was later fenced on three sides with the southern boundary formed by the Mbagathi river open to the plains where game was free to disperse into the 2500 square km. Kitengela Conservation area (Prins & Grootenhuis 2000: 143). Meanwhile, areas surrounding the park, and all over Kenya, were being rapidly taken up with coffee and sisal plantations and fenced farmlands which by the 1950s had just about closed off migration routes. This had a significant impact on the migrating herds, as Prins & Grootenhuis explain:

In the 1950s the fertile, high rainfall areas around Nariobi, Ngong and parts of Thika and Ruiru which constituted dry season areas, were taken up for agriculture and settlement. The plains to the east of Kanza – Athi River – Nairobi railway line were settled by European ranchers, leaving only the area to the west of this line for the original Maasai inhabitants to continue their traditional pastoralism. The area was part of the Southern reserve set aside by the colonial government for Maasai settlement. The cumulative effects of these two forms of land use over 60-70 years have been considerable . . . (Prins & Grootenhuis 2000: 156).

What now remains of Athi-Kapiti ecosystem is confined to the Maasai portion of the plains. It is a small remnant of the former ecosystem and it too is considered to be under severe threat from a variety of human activities (Prins & Grootenhuis 2000: 145). In light of current trends Prins & Grootenhuis predict that wildlife dependent on migration to and from dry land pastures is unlikely to survive although suggestions have been put forward for the creation of a wildlife corridor through which the herds can migrate, and there is a plan to incentivise landowners in this region not to fence (Prins & Grootenhuis 2000: 165-166).

White settlement is seen by scholars like Beinart and Steinhart as the single most important factor in the decline of game numbers during the era of colonial rule in Kenya. Settlers often blamed Africans for many of the problems which were in fact created by colonial incursions - what Beinart calls the ‘unintended’ consequences of imperial presence such as deforestation, introduction of domestic animals turned feral, introduction of crops, weeds and diseases that transformed the ecological balance (Beinart 1990: 167).
His view is in keeping with that of many contemporary ecologists who regard habitat destruction as the most important factor contributing to species extinction (Steinhart 2006: 99). Child and Chitsike argue that most animals can sustain heavy hunting if their habitat remains intact, whereas the real threat to wildlife survival in Africa comes from increasing human populations with no desire to share the land with animals. Furthermore, it is their opinion that much wildlife legislation has failed because it was based on the erroneous belief that decline in game numbers was due to hunting. Game laws placed the emphasis on controlled hunting on the assumption that there was a direct cause-effect relationship between hunting and wildlife numbers (Child and Chitsike 2000: 257-258). Moreover, most game laws, they say, “are based on the mistaken idea that conserving wildlife is essentially an ecological process, when it is a social and economic process” (Child and Chitsike 2000: 254 - 255).

The Vanishing World of Wilderness and Wildlife

I will go on to examine the idea of ‘vanishing world’ of wilderness and wildlife for the remainder of this chapter because it forms an important part of a wider tropology of ‘lost worlds’. Scholars have identified a modern re-evaluation of vanishing ‘tribes’ of Africa, as for instance Landau has done in identifying an essential shift in the western apprehension of ‘the wild’ in relation to perceptions of ‘Bushmen’ in the 1920s in his article With Gun and Camera in South Africa: Constructing the Image of Bushmen, ca. 1880 – 1940 (Steinhart 2006: 142). The trope of vanishing wildlife and wilderness and the re-evaluation of the hunting ethos saw a new attitude emerge that embraced the conservation of wildlife, rather than the destruction of game (Steinhart 2006: 146). This new attitude was positioned in opposition to hunting, which was seen as the main cause of ‘vanishing’ wildlife. This attitude must be viewed in the broader context of immense destruction of wildlife and its habitat that had taken place through fencing, clearing and burning, as well as intense predation through hunting in the period of British colonialism lasting from 1905 and ending in 1961 in Tanganyika and 1963 in Kenya. As I have argued in the chapter ‘The Inverted Landscape,’ a backward-looking romanticism for wilderness spaces arose in conjunction with the rapid economic development of the colonial state, and even more acutely in the intensive post-1945 period of African ‘modernisation’. With the imaginative terrain of ‘wildness’ everywhere under threat, there emerged a profound anxiety about vanishing cultures, wildlife and wilderness in the European consciousness, a sensibility that only appears to have increased as the twentieth-century progressed.

In The Sportsman’s Handbook by Rowland Ward (1906), a seminal reference guide for hunters interested in the pursuit of record heads of game, the author refers to the vastly reduced numbers of game again and again. Ironically, Ward’s lament is most frequently found in the chapter Hunting Fields that is dedicated to describing the best areas in Africa in which sportsmen will find the game that seems to be proving so elusive. In places like the South African Cape, for example, Ward observes that big game has
been all but exterminated due to settlement, and some creatures, like the Blaauwbok and Quagga, have become totally extinct (Ward 1906: 175). These extinctions, however, were attributed by later conservationist C.S. Stokes (1941) not simply to the advance of civilization, as is Ward’s assumption, but directly to the reckless acts of hunters themselves:

Southern Africa remains singularly rich in its fauna. But to-day, tomorrow, and down the tales of years one must keenly lament that the hunter, so largely in the ascendant after the Voortrekker penetrations, in his long and uninterrupted succession of hey-days shot the quagga and bluebuck to annihilation, and the white rhinocerous, mountain zebra, black wildebeest, nyala and bontebok to extermination’s verge . . . “A few grains of powder, a few more of lead, [can] undo in sixty seconds the work of sixty centuries” (Stokes 1941:14).

In the heyday of hunting that followed the Voortrekker penetration into the interior, it was the hunter’s bullet that would end many thousands of years of evolution. But, Stokes tells us confidently, the South African nation has “decisively put a stop to that wholesale and wanton destruction which gravely threatened a number of our creatures with the fate of the bluebuck and quagga” and by 1941 has largely become “enthusiastic and practical protagonists of wild-life preservation, as our sanctuaries reveal” (Stokes 1941:14).

According to long-time warden of the Kruger National Park, Stevenson-Hamilton, by the 1940s a clear change of attitude by Europeans toward hunting could be discerned. In his book about the behaviour and characteristics of wild animals written on his retirement, *Wild Life in South Africa* (1947), he acknowledges that in the thirty years that have passed since his first book on the same subject published in 1912, *Animal Life in Africa*, much has changed:

In the long period that has elapsed since I first wrote of African wild animals, much that once seemed an unattainable dream, a mere mocking mirage, has become commonplace fact. The camera has to a great extent superseded the rifle: the educated public all over the civilized world has begun to interest itself in the preservation rather in than destruction of wild life, and the national parks scheme, that goal of the nature lover, has firmly taken root in Africa (Stevenson-Hamilton 1947: 0).

By the 1940s the educated public had begun to interest itself in the preservation rather than destruction of wild life. Hunting with camera rather than rifle became the moral order of the day, and hunting for sport had become widely regarded as a senseless gratification of the taste for slaughter to the detriment of everyone else and to future generations. National parks had become “the goal of the nature lover” and, as C.S. Stokes wrote in 1941, national institutions like the Kruger National Park had become sanctuaries where wild life could finally live in freedom from hunters.

*IIt is good to know that in South Africa’s national parks, creatures of forest, veld, and vlei, of krans and koppie, sky and stream, have freedom in perpetuity from the hunter. One is profoundly thankful for the legislation, shaped from the unanimity of a nation’s will, whereby our wild life is
again following the Nature-ordained plan, and posterity will be deeply grateful to this generation for the enactments which, as far as man can decree, ensure the survival of our fauna (Stokes 1941:13).

C.S. Stokes sees the establishment of a wild life sanctuary as a restoration of a ‘natural’ way of things, where creatures of the veld can once again live undisturbed by the ‘unnatural’ methods of hunters and their advancing weaponry. The establishment of this reserve is not merely a political decision and act of legislation, but is positioned as being fundamentally in harmony with nature. In *Our Vanishing Wild Life; its Extermination and Preservation* (1913), a book by pioneering American conservationist William T. Hornaday, written at the same time as Stevenson-Hamilton’s early work, *Animal Life in Africa* (1912), we find a different perspective on the matter. By the 1940s Stokes and Stevenson-Hamilton appear to see the national parks scheme and the establishment of wild life sanctuaries as proof of a new dedication to wild life preservation. For Hornaday, however, the existence of wild life sanctuaries and national parks do not prove humankind’s successes at conserving game, but rather its failures.

In order to correctly understand the question of the extinction or preservation of wild life, Hornaday says, it is necessary to recall the near past. Writing in 1913, he tells of a time when the animal life that stocked the country only fifty years before could accurately be described as ‘abundant’:

> Throughout every state, on every shoreline, in all the millions of fresh water lakes, ponds and rivers, in every forest and even on every desert, the wild herd and flocks held away. It was impossible to go beyond the settled haunts of civilized man and escape them (Hornaday 1913: 1) (original emphasis).

Hornaday’s book goes on to emphatically list a ‘rollcall of the dead’, the creatures upon which humankind has wrought what he calls the “capital crime” of extinction. He also provides lists of the “next candidates for oblivion” - highly endangered species of various countries, some of which occur only in zoological gardens and are completely extinct in the wild. These lists are “addressed to the world at large, not as a reproach upon the dead Past which is gone beyond recall, but in the faint hope of somewhere and somehow arousing forces that will reform the Present and save the Future” (Hornaday 1913: 18). The past is gone, but the hard lessons that can be learnt by our recollection of the former abundance of wild life can be used to predict what seems inevitable if no action is taken. Extending this logic, Hornaday takes what had occurred in South Africa as an example by which to correctly forecast the future of the big game of British East Africa:

> In those portions of the great East African plateau region that are suited to modern agriculture, stretching from Buluwayo to northern Uganda, the wild herbs are doomed to be crowded out by the farmer and the fruit-grower. This is the inevitable result of civilization and progress in wild lands. Marauding battalions of zebras, bellicose rhinoceroses and murderous buffaloes do not fit in with ranches and crops, and children going to school. Except in the great game preserves, the
swamps and the dense jungles it is certain that the big game of the whole of eastern Africa is foredoomed to disappear,—the largest and most valuable species first (Hornaday 1913: 183-184).

It is Hornaday’s view that the ultimate result of the failure to stem the wholesale destruction of wild life will result in a situation where endemic flora and fauna will become confined to the great game preserves, and will have vanished from all but the most inaccessible and inhabitable swamps and jungles of Africa. What he feared was not only the incompatibility of wild animals and the objectives of the British Empire, but what he called a “widespread craze for killing big game”. With new methods of mechanized transport providing better accessibility to the region, ever more deadly rifles, the assistance of the expert professional guides of the burgeoning safari industry, and a “ruinously extravagant” bag limit, Hornaday said that he was absolutely certain that any big game outside of the three preserves of East Africa then in existence was bound to disappear in a fraction of the time that it took South Africa to accomplish the same result (Hornaday 1913: 186).

Hornaby’s fears for the vanishing game of Africa diminished where species were ‘naturally’ protected because they inhabited regions that were remote or difficult to penetrate, such as the okapi, gorilla or chimpanzee.

As a species in point, consider the okapi. Only the boldest and most persistent explorers ever have set foot in its tangled and miasmatic haunts. It may be twenty years before a living specimen can be brought out. The gorilla and the chimpanzee are so well protected by the density of their jungles that they never can be exterminated—until the natives are permitted to have all the firearms that they desire! When that day arrives, it is "good-night" to all the wild life that is large enough to eat or to wear (Hornaday 1913: 187).

In this figure we are presented with the savage spectre of humans cannibalistically consuming their evolutionary cousins as a direct result of the ‘contagion’ of western civilization that would put the technology of firearms in the hands of native peoples. Once they have taken on the most debased trappings of white civilization, guns and greed, wholesale slaughter for the consumption of wild meat and animal products will be the result. The ability of indigenous peoples to ‘live amicably among the game’ was seen as a noble characteristic by Hornaby, a perception which we see translated into contemporary notions of the inherent ecological wisdom of non-industrial peoples whose activities are assumed to be at one with the environment. But what was esteemed as a ‘natural state’ of moral innocence by Hornaday was used by others to characterize them as indiscriminate and animalistic meat-eaters.

Hornaday had called the extinction of species a “black disgrace to the races of civilized mankind . . . because savages don’t do it!” (Hornaday 1913: 8). Indigenous peoples in their ‘original’ and ‘traditional’ figuration lived in a state of balance with the wild creatures around them, hunting only for the meat that they required as they had done for millennia, and therefore occupied a state of moral innocence that was equivalent with their state of nature: “In a state of nature where wild creatures prey upon wild creatures,
such a thing as wanton, wholesale and utterly wasteful slaughter is almost unknown!” (Hornaday 1913: 9)
(original emphasis). It is civilised man who kills for tusk or horn, or shoots entire flocks of fowl for sport, or
who, simply for visceral pleasure, destroys “a whole colony of hippopotami,-- actually damming a river
with their bloated and putrid carcasses, all untouched by the knife” (Hornaday 1913: 10). In his hunt for
sport or pleasure, civilized man is set apart from all predatory animals, and can only be classed with his
nearest natural equivalent - the cruel wolf and the criminal dog (Hornaday 1913: 9-10). And yet,
paradoxically, it is the very disdain of wild flesh that has enabled European hunting to be set aside as ‘the
prince of sports’ in Africa. Hunting for sport is not the debased desire to satisfy hunger or a primitive
quest for meat and hide, but the pursuit of the aesthete for the most magnificent representation of a
type; it is the search of the naturalist for the perfect specimen, or the skill of the sportsman in his
selection and shooting of the ideal of the species for purposes of display. Civilized man hunts not out of
need, as do indigenous peoples or the low-class poor, but outside of his requirements and in excess of
them. In this figuration it is civilized man, unlike his savage brethren, who stands presumptuously outside
of the state of nature.

The ‘failure’ of the conservation of wild life which resulted in the creation of great game preserves of
Africa can be attributed directly to the successes of the civilising mission of the colonial state. It was
widely assumed that advancing civilization would inevitably result in the transformation of wilderness into
landscape of development everywhere except in these preserves. And so wild life conservationists
“concentrated their efforts on creating a system of national parks in colonial Africa that would provide
sanctuary from African and white hunting as well as from the development agenda that was focused on
the transformation of nature for increased production” (Neumann 1995: 152). Neumann argues that
nature was produced through colonial administration’s concomitant efforts at ‘development’ that
resulted in ever-advancing landscapes of agriculture and commerce, while simultaneously recasting other
spaces in that same landscape “in the image of their dreams of a wild continent” (Neumann 1995: 149).

The British preservationists were driven in part by the fear of losing ‘Eden’ – a fear that their vision
of Africa as primeval wilderness was fading before their eyes. Africa as Eden has long been part of
the consciousness of European explorers and travelers, though it is by no means the only or even
principle conceptualisation. The Edenic theme is, however, particularly strong in East Africa where
the tremendous herds of wild animals migrating across the savannah still capture the European
imagination (Neumann 1995b: 154).

It would be the Game Department, the militarised and bureaucratic apparatus of the capitalist state,
which would play a decisive role in the production of nature in the colonies. When the Tanganyikan Game
Department was first created in 1919 its only purpose was “the preservation of animals in their natural
state in as large numbers as possible”, but by 1925 its mission had expanded to include “the protection of
European and African cultivation against game” (Ofcansky 2002: 54). In Tanganyika the difficulties posed
by game preservation, the demands of development, settler interests and the international mandate to protect the interests of the indigenous people of the territory produced the paradox of ruthless extermination of game in some areas and a precious regard for its preservation in others. Although processes of development and preservation appear to be in opposition, and produce different landscapes, they are linked by the shared assertion of European control over society and nature in Africa (Neumann 1995: 156). This converging ideological formation explains why Game Preservation Departments in East Africa were tasked with and initiated projects that involved the massive extermination of wildlife and destruction of wilderness, all the while simultaneously acting to preserve it in game controlled areas, reserves and parks.

Much has been written about the role of the gun in colonial Africa by authors such as Landau and Beinart, but little has been written about the decisive role the Game Department had to play in the destruction of wild life and its habitat to make way for capitalist development. “Game Control is the essential corollary of Game Preservation” was the view of Captain T.A. Ritchie, Warden of the Kenya Game Department from 1923 to 1946 (Hunter 1952: xi). The elimination of animals, he explains, was undertaken by the Department either for the reason of “Biological Control”, or because it had been decided that “their continued existence is not tolerable” (Hunter 1952: xii). Biological control was aimed at deliberately reducing the numbers of a particular species where the ‘balance of nature’ had been upset, perhaps as a result of the restriction of habitat where that species had become too numerous for the environment (Hunter 1952: xii). According to Ritchie, both game control and game preservation are borne out of the fundamental conflict between wild fauna and mankind, since “no human community will tolerate in its vicinity the existence - much less subscribe to the protection – of species that are a perpetual source of danger or depredation.” In a country rich in indigenous fauna this conflict posed a range of problems, from that prime preoccupation of all East African Game Wardens, the elephant and its destructive feeding habits, to “the temerity of duiker eating the rose bushes in the gardens of Government” (Hunter 1952: xi). To prevent the unrestricted destruction of these animals, Ritchie says, the Game Department followed a three-phase process:

(1) Driving animals from where their presence is undesirable to unclaimed areas where they can find ‘Lebensraum’. (2) Where (1) is not possible, instilling discipline – usually oft-reiterated and painful lessons! – so that animals will respect man and his husbandry, and thereby learn a provisional tolerance. (3) Where (1) and (2) are impossible or ineffective, local extermination may be inevitable (Hunter 1952: xii).

J.A. Hunter was employed by the Kenyan Game Department as a Control Officer in June 1927 (Ofcanksy 2002: 25). His was a class of Game Control work that invariably concerned category (3) above, local extermination. It was a job of extreme danger, for “a Control Officer has often to deal with beasts that are malicious and cunning, rogues perhaps, or at least animals that have had previous and unpleasant
experience of man” (Hunter 1952: xii). It was also dangerous work because, unlike the big game hunter shooting for sport, hunting “on Control” involved foregoing the luxury of choosing a time and place, or the correct conditions for the shot. Instead it meant exterminating an animal under whatever circumstances it presented itself, whether favourable or not (Hunter 1952: xii). It was also essential that no wounded animal be allowed to escape.

It was a border war. To avoid the need for ‘local extermination’, the Game Department would drive animals to where they could find, in Ritchie’s unfortunate turn of phrase, ‘Lebensraum’. The fundamental problem with this policy was that uninhabited territories of land were becoming an increasingly rare in the developing African state of the ‘late’ colonial period, for which reason colonialists felt it necessary to set aside wilderness areas in the form of national parks. Wilderness is, after all, fundamentally inimical to the ethos of capitalism in principle:

The idea of a singular, uncommodified territory of land stands on the stage of modernity as an outlaw. Land - its material heterogeneity, its geographical and geopolitical variations, its embedded historical relation to tribes, clans, ethnicities, cultures, religions, and nations - has become, in the conceptualized “world picture” of a global order, a phenomenon to be erased (Marzec 2002:151).

For this reason, wild animals that occur outside of preserves and move between properties or legal jurisdictions have come to be described in current conservationist terminology as ‘fugitive’. Colonial-era game laws converted wild animals into ownerless and price-less assets protected by law, but the state also engaged in many actions to destroy these animals in the name of agricultural expansion and rural development, embarking up on elimination programmes in the name of tsetse control and the prevention of livestock diseases (Child and Chitsike 2000: 254). The state took whole responsibility for managing wildlife by exercising its right to ‘kill’ or ‘let live’, to extend Foucault’s concept of biopower, by driving wildlife into game preserves, and by decimating wildlife outside of them.

The major problem with trying to protect big game, J.A. Hunter said, was that the beasts do not know the boundaries of the reserves. They wander outside of protected areas doing damage, and so must be destroyed. The issue of dangerous and depredatory animals wandering outside of protected areas was ongoing throughout East Africa. But far more pressing was the need to exterminate big game from what had once been habitual feeding grounds. One such programme devised by the Ugandan Game Department of the 1930s was the “Toro Special Elephant Scheme” in which six hunters were licenced to shoot one hundred elephants each over the course of six months. In 1935 Pitman, Uganda’s Chief Game Warden from 1925 to1950, revealed that an estimated 14000 elephants had been killed over the last decade but he still saw the need for ‘control’ measures in all regions except the Eastern Province. Due to short funding, Pitman made use of the European officers of the Kings African Rifles 4th battalion in many control operations and at times even enlisted European administrative officials to fill in as temporary
game rangers. As assistant District Commissioner Rennie Bere admitted, he rarely missed opportunities to shoot elephants on behalf of the Ugandan game department (Ofcansky 2002: 42). Control operations undertaken by the game department fared little better because, between 1924 and 1939 at least, over half of Uganda’s game rangers sported military rank but had little or no scientific training. As a result control operations were “organised along the lines of a military campaign without the slightest reference to ecological principles” (Ofcansky 2002: 43).

Leader-Williams tells us that the destruction of crop-raiding animals was the only legal form of use of wild life that indigenous populations could employ, since they were compensated for crop losses from the meat of carcasses. Rural peoples might have benefited from the discarded meat of state-ordained slaughter, but the government and game departments benefited also from sale of ivory, rhino horn or hides. Steadily increasing numbers of elephants were shot ‘on control’ from 1922 to 1973 in Tanzania, a number that peaked in the 1960s at a staggering figure of 3000 to 4000 elephants a year, the majority taken from around the Selous Game Reserve in south-east Tanzania. With the quantities of ivory accrued from these operations, the Tanganyikan Game Preservation Department was in effect able to cover its budget (Leader-Williams 2000: 225). The increase in the ‘control’ of elephants over this fifty-year period was no doubt due to rapidly rising human populations and decreasing habitat ranges, which exacerbated the need for their elimination in ever-increasing areas of settlement. But it also brought much needed revenue into state coffers.

J.A. Hunter confesses that it was only through the unparalleled opportunities afforded by his job in the Kenya Game Preservation Department that he was able to achieve hunting records with several of the big game animals of Kenya.

I have hunted every type of big game in Africa both as a white hunter and an employee of the game department doing control work. I have not specialized in any one type of hunting. Yet, because I lived during a period when it was necessary to shoot large numbers of game animals to make way for the rapidly expanding population, I have established records of one kind or another with several of the big game animals. I do not say this boastfully, as, given my opportunities, any experienced white hunter could do as well or better (Hunter 1952: 227).

In the chapter dedicated to recounting the “The Great Makuene Rhino Hunt”, Hunter’s state-sponsored exploits tend to recall in scale if not dramatic content the early excesses of hunters like Cummings and Selous. In it he describes how he personally shot over one thousand rhino in the Machakos district in Kenya because the Wakamba tribe “had increased at least sixfold” and the “rhinos had become a genuine menace” (Hunter 1952: 227). The Wakamba bowmen could not be left to deal with it themselves, for if they had been “let loose with arrows” the place would have become “a living hell - complete with numbers of wounded rhinos at large” (Hunter 1952: 153). Intervention in ‘the natural order’ was an enactment of repressive power through which Europeans could demonstrate their mastery over wild
nature as well as control over indigenous society. And so Hunter single-handedly took on the job on behalf of the state. It was, he says, “one hunt that will doubtless rank as the greatest big-game hunt ever undertaken by me – or for that matter anyone else” (Hunter 1952: 153). It was a record, not of size of tusks or horn, but of numbers.

After Hunter and his team had eliminated the black rhino in the Machakos district and cleared the bush, he reflected upon his labours:

We could walk freely through the bush now for there was little chance of meeting rhino . . . labour gangs had been moving steadily behind us, cutting down the bush and clearing the land. What had a short time before been as wild a bit of Africa as God ever made was now farming country. Not a tree or bush remained. Now that the scrub was gone I could see the white network of rhino trails criss-crossing over the whole land . . . The freakish beasts that had that had travelled those trails for centuries were now dead and gone (Ofcansky 2002: 25-26) (my emphasis).

As this passage makes clear, the game department acted as the government's land clearing agent (Ofcansky 2002: 25). Many other 'control' schemes continued were devised by the department that enlisted settler assistance. For instance, in 1924 the Kenyan game department under the leadership of Archie Ritchie gave 20,000 rounds of ammunition to five African game scouts and dispatched them to the Uasin Gishu Plateau in North Western Kenya. They were instructed to conduct wholesale slaughter of the vast herds of zebra in the hope that this would resolve an ongoing problem of competition with Afrikaner farmers for limited resources. By the end of 1924, the scouts had killed approximately 4000 zebra (Ofcansky 2002: 24). At first the Game department recouped some of the operation’s cost by selling each hide for 3 shillings. This trade became so profitable that, by 1925, the price had risen to 10 shillings per hide. When the game authorities permitted private citizens to sell hides at this price, scores of settlers joined the enterprise. Consequently, by the end of 1926, the zebra had almost vanished from the plateau (Ofcansky 2002: 25).

This question of the survival of wild life outside of reserves is an issue of vital concern to conservationists today, particularly in East Africa where aerial surveys have determined that the majority of wild life is still to be found beyond the reserve boundary. In contrast to the protectionist policies of an earlier era, today conservationist fear that wild life isolated in national parks and reserves do not offer a viable resource to ensure future survival of these populations. National parks and game reserves that had once been heralded as the final retreats of wild life and its habitats are today recognized as an inadequate means through which to sustain wild life populations in the long term. As a result, there is a new tendency to regard the East African national park not as an enclosed entity, but as the critical core of a wild life population that will in the future enable game to disperse into buffer zones in the immediate surrounds and even beyond. In these buffer zones big game hunting by international tourists is seen as a low-impact
high-return means of using the land in way that would also economically benefit local populations and encourage their participation in the conservation of wildlife through economic self-interest.

Wildlife occurring outside of reserves is unprotected by law and the question of the survival of larger game outside of reserves throughout Africa, and especially in East Africa, has been raised as a matter of urgent concern:

A study of the distribution of many wildlife species shows that their range is shrinking over Africa and in many places where, only a decade ago, one could meet black rhinoceros, elephant, or even just Thompson’s gazelle or impala, they are now gone. In some areas, this disappearance from their former ranges has been gradual for hundreds of years, as in South Africa, but in other areas, it is a recent phenomenon. For instance in Kenya, wildlife still occurs outside the protected areas but often their numbers show a worrisome downward trend which could herald their imminent demise (Prins & Grootenhuis 2000: 4).

Since 1977 the Kenyan Department of Resource Surveys and Remote Sensing (DRSRS) has been conducting aerial surveys to determine game numbers, and analysis of these findings show that numbers are in decline. They also show that to 70 percent of all wildlife is to be found in non-protected areas, with the highest concentrations of game in protected areas or within ten to twenty kilometers of them (Ottichilo et al 2000: 213).

In summary, the centrally managed protectionism inherited from colonial era preservation policies are now seen by scholars as counter-productive to the aims of governments looking to conserve wildlife for the future. Allocating the use of wildlife from the state to landholders and communities, it is widely argued, will be the best means of ensuring its survival. Conferring rights of ownership and the use of wild animals is part of their commodification on the open market, which is today widely seen as the key to ensuring their survival. Graham Child and Langford Chitsike assert that proprietorship and price are the main factors regulating whether wildlife will be actively conserved on productive land outside protected areas (Child and Chitsike 2000: 247-248). Moreover, they say, it is difficult to comprehend the significance of the value of wildlife and price is the easiest determinant whereby one can determine the level of benefit to be derived from wildlife as an asset. The degree to which wildlife has a use-value that results in exchange-value can range from the primarily ‘aesthetic’ function that draws visitors to East African national parks to view game in its natural setting, to ‘canned’ animals where creatures are kept in a closed area for the purposes of trophy hunting.

It is important to note that the various uses of wild species suggested in sustainability scenarios in actual fact represent stages towards their domestication (Child and Chitsike 2000: 248). Domesticated animals are thought to be ‘owned’, but the idea of the ownership of wild animals confounds an easy classification. Such animals can range from individual creatures that have been habituated through being confined
under intensive management, to those that have lost their fear of man through association, to truly wild individuals (Child and Chitsike 2000: 263). However, endemic animals roaming within their own habitats, even if confined to national parks, are generally considered to be wild and ‘free’, and this is much of their appeal. Child and Chitsuke, recognising this, suggest that the general commodification of wild animals might mar Africa’s reputation as the main site of a prodigious and untouched nature that is the critical draw card for countless European tourists in the first place. They therefore advocate using wildlife “sensibly”, that is, “without destroying the charismatic wild properties which are the ‘glamour’ that sells many wildlife products, including tourism and hunting. Bluntly put, “if wild animals cease to be wild they will lose much of the value that gives them their comparative advantage over domestic animals and their ability to reverse the poverty vortex in Africa” (Child and Chitsike 2000: 264).

According to the principle of res nullius wild animals are a fugitive resource that cannot be owned until they are captured, restrained or killed” (Child and Chitsike 2000: 257). For this reason wild animals hold a special place in the western imagination for they are popularly conceived of as the remnants of a longed-for free and primordial nature. Because the ‘use’ of wildlife is philosophically inimical to the essence of ‘wildness’, much of their value rests in their singular status as uncommodified creatures on the global stage of capitalist modernity. And this is precisely why wild animals occupy a special place in the imaginative realm of ‘wildness’ that drive western economies of value and desire.
CHAPTER 3: The Inverted Landscape

Colonial Development and the Compensatory Enclave

The ‘wild nature(s)’ of Africa have long been the locus of the ‘primitivist’ desires of the west, but by the mid-twentieth century the African continent had undergone several decades of economic development, and with the land and its peoples within grasp of modernization, a profound anxiety about vanishing cultures and vanishing wild life and wilderness emerged in the European consciousness. We may cynically observe that the discourse of preservation finds its compunctions in destruction, just as myths of origins converge with fears of extinction. These themes have appeared throughout the imperialist enterprise, but emerged quite distinctly in the late phase of imperialism in East Africa, not so much in competition with ideals of progress and development but in conjunction with them as a kind of ‘compensatory’ idiom. The focus of this chapter is a discussion of the western cultural phenomenon of the ‘primitive’ desire for wilderness by the West in the context of global capitalism.

In the years leading up to independence, an accelerated process of control of nature resulted in the production of landscapes of thriving capitalist enterprise on the one hand and the establishment of compensatory preserves of wilderness on the other. The paradoxical conceptualisation of the East African colony as a place of intense modernisation and as a place of primitive wilderness has been remarkably persistent. This dual conceptualisation is illustrated in the March 1950 edition of National Geographic which featured a two-part article on British East Africa. The first part of the article was dedicated to describing the modernisation and transformation of land in the colonies entitled ‘Britain Tackles the East African Bush’. This article is immediately followed by another that celebrates East Africa’s wilderness and wildlife, ‘Roaming Africa’s Unfenced Zoos’. This feature conjures the romantic vision of unenclosed vastnesses where animals occur in primitive abundance. Both conceptualisations in this double feature on the colony can be seen as symptomatic of the same ethos, for even after years of capitalist development Africa has continued to be imagined as one of the world repositories of a wild and abundant ‘nature.’ For instance, Lutz & Collins have identified a trend where readers of National Geographic tend to be less interested in articles about people in developing Africa are more inclined to read articles about ‘wild’ Africa:

Some force has been retained by the European tradition which saw Africa as excessive, incommensurate, prodigious, incomprehensible. There is a longstanding sense that the value of Africa lies in its hold on remnants of a free and primordial nature, something that is reflected in its popularity as a subject of American fiction and art. For contemporary Americans the innumerable
television nature shows [continue] Africa’s reputation as the main site of a fantastic and untouched nature (Lutz & Collins 1993: 133) (my emphasis).

There is a longstanding sense that the value of Africa lies in its hold on remnants of a free and primordial nature. The western travel quest in search of 'noble nature' for 'natural states' was applied to the wilderness landscapes of East Africa in the colonial era, but is a mythical concept that is remarkably persistent. “There is no fixity in mythical concepts”, Barthes once said, “they can come into being, alter, disintegrate, disappear completely. And it is precisely because they are historical that history can very easily suppress them (Barthes 1957: 120). For this reason, I have dedicated this chapter to outlining some of the mythical precepts that support the modern conceptualisations of wilderness spaces in East Africa. They are in part derived from the Romantic landscape tradition and emerged in the British colonies of East African in the form of an attachment to the idea of 'pristine' wilderness yet untouched by capitalist development, a landscape idea that continues materially in the form of national parks.

Part of the partitioning of the landscape included the creation of national parks based on a preconceived and culturally constituted vision of Africa as primeval wilderness. In a climate overwhelmingly oriented toward colonial progress and the realization of what Mitchell has called the "utopian fantasies of the perfected imperial prospect" of the future, there also arose a kind of retrospective utopia or 'back to nature' impulse which sought to retain Africa as the locus of prelapsarian states of nature (Mitchell 1994: 10). It is an impulse that did not revel in the changes of capitalist development and the triumphant ethos of progress in which the present was held to be a process of continual advancement towards a glorious future. Instead, it seems to have represent a desired to halt this inexorable advance not only by preserving some natural landscapes in their 'precapitalist' form, but even to reverse time itself by creating certain 'pre-colonial' spaces that preserved time and space before colonial invasion. In other words, the national park as a landscape isolated from change could be reminiscent of a lost past, when the European traveller in Africa could still find in the unbounded views of wilderness illimitable prospects for personal and national endeavor.

The image of ‘creative destruction’ is essential to an understanding of the dilemmas of modernity in the imperialist context. In East Africa the development of the colony required the massive destruction of wilderness, dialectically producing a desire for what had been lost. Or, as Berman describes in his book describing the experience of modernity (1982), capitalist development may transform the ‘wasteland’ of wilderness, but there is a concomitant transformation within the developer:

It appears that the very process of development, even as it transforms the wasteland into a thriving physical and social space, recreates the wasteland inside of the developer himself. This is how the tragedy of development works (Harvey 1989:16).
A key tenet of my argument is that the European appropriation of the African landscape for aesthetic consumption is inseparable from the appropriation of African land for material production (Neumann 1998: 9). The human transformation of nature under the forces of capitalism are part of a global system within which even the most geographically remote regions are incorporated as part of the process of uneven development that presumed that in Africa national self-realisation would follow in the wake of the capitalist free market. The African landscape became partitioned in ways directly attributable to capitalist development under the broader interests of its incorporation into the global economy. The result was an uneven spread of modernization which could be seen reflected in the variety of intermediate and hybrid forms of society and landscape, depending on local responses by indigenous communities, and their resistance to or active participation in development of resources in the interests of capital accumulation. Uneven development also occurs on a regional level, for development is dependent on the resource endowments of each region and the diversity of local ecology and climate that determined the extent to which a landscape could be transformed for commercial exploitation.\(^5\)

The transformation of nature in East Africa took place over an inordinately brief amount of time, and in those short decades nature was conquered with unprecedented violence. The obliteration of vast areas of wilderness in the African tropics, as elsewhere, seems to concomitantly obliterate something essential to the western psyche. And the recognition of this loss - not just of species or vistas but of an aspect of self, personhood and even nationhood – has come to play a role the establishment of national parks and reserves. Freud himself recognized something of the therapeutic value of wild landscape, and declared that the physical reserve of the nature park performed a function similar to the mental reserve of fantasy.

The creation of the mental domain of phantasy has a complete counterpart in the establishment of ‘reservations’ and nature parks’ in places where the inroads of agriculture, traffic, or industry threaten to change the original face of the earth rapidly into something unrecognisable. The ‘reservation’ is to maintain the old condition of things which has been regretfully sacrificed to necessity everywhere else; there everything may grow and spread as it pleases, including what is useless and even what is harmful. The mental realm of phantasy is also such a reservation reclaimed from the encroaches of the reality-principle (Freud in the 23rd of his Introductory Lectures on Psycho-Analysis quoted in Bate 1991: 52).

In the mental domain, fantasy functions as a ‘reserve’ from the encroachment of reality, just as in the physical domain the national park functions as a reserve from the encroachment of civilization; both,

\(^5\) Uneven development in the local context of the African colony can be seen as a geographical expression of the contradictions inherent in the constitution and structure of capital itself (Smith 1984: xi).
Freud suggests here, are necessary for the health of the whole. What is most important to note is Freud’s metaphorical equivalence between the realm of imagination and fantasy and the realm of wilderness. In doing so he draws upon a longstanding conceptualisation of wilderness that has, to the western mind, been a space inherently associated with the metaphysical realm; a place of terror, transgression and danger or spiritual quietude, contemplation and purification:

In the wilderness the boundaries between the human and the nonhuman, between natural and supernatural, had always been less certain than elsewhere . . . One might meet devils and run the risk of losing one’s soul in such a place, but one might also meet God. For some that possibility was worth almost any price (Cronin 1995: 73).

Wilderness is a space of the imagination; it contains untold terrors and delights. But the setting aside of wilderness in the form of the reserve is a profoundly modern idea that is inextricably linked to global capitalism. Such ‘reservations’ play a role in maintaining the “old conditions of things which has regretfully been sacrificed to necessity everywhere else”, as Freud puts it. For this reason wild nature over the course of the twentieth-century came increasingly to be figured as a refuge not only for animals but for humankind. An example of such a conceptualisation is beautifully put in the foreword by Frederica Louise, the Crown Princess of Greece, to a book about South Africa’s Kruger National Park published in 1941:

There is a natural sanctuary where the animals so long hunted by man have at last found a refuge created for them by merciful man himself. On entering you feel that all troubles of the outer world – no matter how heavy they may be – are alleviated. The animal sanctuary becomes a sanctuary for man himself, where amid the vast horizons of the veld, he finds himself again brought back to those lost days of Paradise when his animal brethren not yet feared him, their lord, and lived freely under his eyes their eternal life of love and strife (Stokes 1941:7).

The animal sanctuary has become the sanctuary for humankind, where ‘vast horizons’, in the language of the sublime, allow human beings to find themselves in a limitless landscape endowed with spiritual and transcendental significance. The national park is a sanctuary where, because there are no hunters and the animals have lost their fear, humankind can experience what the Paradisiacal garden may have been like before the fall. In this way the establishment of the national park is positioned as an Edenic recovery narrative, where humankind can experience the friendship of the beasts in freedom from the ‘troubled outer world’.

As expressed in this example, wilderness is popularly conceived as a space isolated and apart from an outer world inhabited by humanity. In other words it is “a pristine sanctuary where the last remnant of an untouched, endangered, but still transcendent nature can for at least a little while longer be encountered without the contaminating taint of civilization” (Cronin 1995:69). And yet the wilderness sanctuary should not be conceived of as a space existing outside of capitalism, but as fundamentally part of it.
parks and reserves are produced in response to the global commoditisation of land; not only are they a product of the effects of capitalism but they are commodified spaces in themselves. Nevertheless, such wilderness spaces function as places of refuge from the ‘reality-principle’ of the capitalist social formation. Their un ravaged haunts offer the traveller consolation and escape in an experience of time outside of the vitiating effects of modernity and the losses of innocence that this entails (Curtis and Pajaczkowska 1994: 199).

Wilderness areas in the form of national parks and reserves can be seen as a product of an increasingly global civilization dominated by the socio-economic formation of capitalism. Wilderness sanctuaries play an essential imaginative role within this ethos. They act as the fount of a restorative, curing, spiritual nature for the individual, but also function therapeutically on a national level, as Haraway points out in relation to the United States. Here national parks perform crucial political function in the American national psyche:

And like any expanding capitalist society that must continually destroy what it builds and feed off every being it perceives as natural - if its strategies of accumulation of wealth are to push the envelope of catastrophe - the United States is consumed with images of decadence, obsolescence, and corruption of kind. No wonder its national parks and its stories of gardens and wilderness have been more therapeutically crucial to nursing national innocence than any of its civic sacraments (Haraway 1995: 322).

For Haraway it is the United States’ national parks rather than the American countryside that are the therapeutic antidote of a consumptive capitalist society expressed symptomatically as a kind of national decadence.

In the spatial relations of land, the city is the centre of the marketplace and of production that spreads outward concentrically to encompass outlying areas, agricultural land and the land beyond that, until all becomes capitalized in the interests of commodity production. In this conceptualisation, agricultural land can be considered "merely space extensive industries dependent on the life of the urban market-place" (Cosgrove 1984: 44). The countryside can no longer be imagined as the opposite of the city, the locus of a rural idyll, but rather the spatially spread-out structures of a singular social formation - the monoculture of industrial capitalism. The agricultural landscape can thus be conceived as a factory for the production of raw materials in the accumulation of capital, and, accordingly, displays the characteristic traits of 'improvement': expansion, mechanised efficiency and technological innovation. In the modern era the logic agricultural development involves a progression toward technological efficiency, its ultimate effect being the uniformity of landscapes throughout the world:

Current indications are that rural areas will become more standardised in their organisation and appearance around the world, just as modern and post-modern urban landscapes have become more commonplace in the cities of all continents, exhibiting its features of simplification, capital
investment in technology to boost production, regulation of working practices and quality of output, and restructuring for the extraction of minimum surplus value (Atkins: 1998: 174).

Atkins asserts that through the increasing similarity of the type of land-use that occurs in rural areas, land is becoming similar all over the globe – rural areas are becoming standardised scenes of production because the homogenizing spread of the capitalism and its attendant technologies produce sameness in the interests of intensification of output. In this way we can, and often do, figure the landscape as areas existing in various unevenly distributed stages on the road to 'saturated' development (Atkins: 1998: 174). The ultimate effect is a globalised homogeneity to which campaigns for biological diversity are addressed. Mowforth has pointed how contemporary conservation armies or “eco-missionaries” have fanned out across the globe to “green the earth’s poor” (Mowforth 1998: 49). Their crusade, he says, finds its moral basis in the idea of the ‘oneness’ of the earth founded on the notion of globalisation: a global economy, a global culture and a global ecosystem (Mowforth 1998: 49).

Capitalism is ferociously global. It continuously advances outward from the metropolitan centre, driven by the endless need for accumulation that in turn drives innovation of production techniques and the continual invention of commodities in order to accumulate and grow more capital. This expanding economy of capitalism Freeman describes as a "force of speculative energy and totalizing power [that] transcends moral, political, or ethical precepts; like a tidal wave it engulfs whatever it encounters" (Freeman 1995: 59). It is the totalising tendency of capitalism that makes it imperialist, sweeping away all diversity in its path, eliminating natural habitats and replacing them with commodified terrains. It as a phenomenon in which the of national economic systems are integrated into the world economy though international trade, investment and capital flows which has as its effect an increase in the transfer of social and cultural values. This, then, is the context in which I am interpreting Mitchell’s core premise that "landscape is not only a matter of internal politics and national or class ideology but also an international, global phenomenon, intimately bound up with the discourses of imperialism” (Mitchell 1994: 9).

Just as with the centripetal effect of the city upon the outlying environment, the capitalist economy can be conceived on a global scale as a relation between metropole and periphery, where imperial powers centered in Europe had monopolised outlying colonies as markets for raw materials and profit. Here we find what Bunn has called the "displacement of the country-city dichotomy onto world geography” (Bunn 1994: 129). As his metaphor implies, it is a relation that is imaginative and therapeutic as well as economic. It suggests that countries of commerce and culture where urbanisation and industrialization are rife look elsewhere on the global periphery for large tracts of ‘unmodified’ wilderness. The contemporary quest for wilderness appears to be caught up in fantasies of authentic origins and 'pure' states. It is concerned with the cultural phenomenon in which the western world seek out spaces of spiritual and ontological sublimation in which we seek transcendence from the modern human condition,
or at the very least escape from the overwhelming sameness of capitalist modernity. The malaise of modernity is reflected in certain aspects of the mass phenomenon of bourgeois leisure travel in the twenty-first century, especially that aspect of tourism that caters for a fascination for remote ecosystems. Here the word "wilderness" signals not just an invitation to adventure but also nostalgia for unspoiled origins (Slater 1995: 117). In places like these we may say, after Haraway, that capitalist society feeds off everything it perceives as natural (Haraway 1995: 322). Or, as Lefebvre scathingly put it, "a ravenous consumption picks over the last remnants of nature and the past in search of whatever nourishment may be obtained from the signs of anything historical or original" (Neumann 1998: 22 quoting Lefebvre 1991: 84).

Africa functions as one of the repositories of ‘nature’ on the map of the world whose wilderness spaces have become global commodities on the open market.

With money as capital’s general equivalent, its abstract axiomatic, capital can be grafted on any territory, and on any difference generated within a particular territory. In this sense, it can deterrioralise what was once intrinsic or peculiar to a territory, placing it within the universal flow of a global economy (Marzec 2002: 152).

Capital can become drafted onto any territory, and any cultural or territorial ‘otherness’ can be appropriates within the universal flow of the global economy. This brings me to the question of national parks in East Africa. Who frequents them and to whom do they cater? The answer must be that they overwhelmingly cater to a western international community. The desire to view and experience wild landscapes is a commodity sold primarily to people who travel from ‘developed’ countries of commerce and culture where wilderness is a relative rarity and has therefore become highly valued, as I discuss in my chapter, ‘The Contested Landscape’ (Neumann 1998: 32).

**The Primitivist Desire for 'Noble Natures' and 'Natural States'**

The national park is a construction, a kind of inverted space that exists side-by-side with the obverse and variegated terrains of capitalist development from which all of these landscapes have sprung. It must be remembered that although the processes of development and preservation are commonly conceived as in opposition and clearly produce different landscape spaces, they are produced by the same ideological framework, namely "the assertion of European control over society and nature in Africa" (Neumann 1995b: 149-150). The national park is, conceivably, an 'other' space in that it is conceptually isolated from the types of ‘developed’ terrain that surrounds it. This isolation has led to a visual difference marked by an abundance of vegetation and wildlife which tends to suggest that time has been arrested within this enclosed area. The national park exists in the present as a testament to the past, 'how it was before', and therefore functions in contrast to but also in relation to the surrounding landscapes. In the desire for an
original and untouched wilderness landscape in Africa, we encounter a different kind of primitivist nostalgia, one that is not focused upon ‘natural man’ but upon ‘natural’ landscapes.

National parks in Africa are fundamentally premised upon the idea of a pristine and uninhabited nature. American and English models of preserving the natural landscape are based on the idea of uninhabited nature, but with a fundamental difference. In England, typically, national parks do not consist of enclosed areas owned by the state, but are comprised of an amalgam of privately owned lands and lands owned by the National Trust. Most importantly, these lands may be used for commercial ends such as farming and forestry (Bate 1991: 49). The English Enclosure Acts were the historical means by which the elite were able to dispossess the English peasantry of access to what was previously communal land. The privatisation of land ownership and enclosure of common lands prevalent in rural England during the transition to capitalism, were implemented not only to facilitate capitalist production, but to create private landscape parks as well. Whole villages were sometimes razed for purely aesthetic reasons, as Neumann points out, in order to produce a nature without humans and human labour (Neumann 1995b: 152). Painterly representations of rural landscape were elitist, as Barrell has argued, and echoed the ideal of the landscape emptied of signs of labour.

National parks in East Africa did not follow the British model, but followed the American style of nature preservation in which wild nature was set aside and administered by a government that disallowed any form of settlement or development within declared areas. Yellowstone national park became the model not only for national parks in tropical East Africa, but also for the Kruger National Park in South (Neumann (1998), Carruthers (1995)).

    The critical component, symbolically and practically, of the law that created Yellowstone as a model for all of the world’s national parks was the prohibition against human settlement and activities. This clause reflects the essence of the landscape way of seeing: the removal of all evidence of human labour, the separation of the observer from the land, and the spatial division of production and consumption (Neumann 1998:24).

In this conceptualisation of landscape, wilderness areas are those places untouched by agriculture or human pastoralism of any kind, and as such are conceived as untouched by human intervention and unsullied by human labour. In this sense the landscape emptied of human signification is seen as ‘pristine’. This figuration is mythical, for, as Ranger reminds us, the 'empty' landscape is a ‘failure of the historical imagination’ (Ranger 2000: 54). Evidence of the impact of human agency in altering even those environments imagined to be pristine wilderness serves to remind us that landscape is a social product, the consequence of collective human transformation of nature (Cosgrove 1984: 14). Nevertheless the myth of the pristine and primordial landscapes is extremely persistent; it can be seen as an expression of
primitivism that, although different to the search for primitivism in indigenous cultures, expresses similar traits of essentialism, longing for authenticity and quests for origin.

One could say that the desire for and travel to 'primitive' landscapes implies that remnants of the primordial past exist and can still be found in present places. Such places are largely confined to national parks and reserves or protected by legislation that disallows change. National parks are therefore popularly conceived as islands in time or vignettes of "how it was before humans altered [wild] landscapes permanently" but they are in fact just another form of humanized landscape with its own history of legislative and political intervention (Atkins: 1998: 267). The viewing of wilderness landscape involves what one could call a 'cultivated' regard that is historically, socially and culturally derived. Like Mitchell, my contention is that the landscape of the national park hides the artificiality of its cultural and social construction within its 'naturalness'. We should not regard national parks, even in Africa, as 'natural' environments any more than we do museums and parks; they are cultural artifacts. Their practical or utilitarian objectives should not obscure the fact that they are institutionally constructed and politically contested spaces, and, moreover, legislatively guaranteed only within the prevailing social climate; in other words, they are historically contingent, and may occur only as the material manifestation of a particular social formation or set of social values.

In East Africa, national parks expressed a particular imperialist vision, a dream of what 'wild Africa' should be that became realised in material form. Nature was produced in national parks according to a vision of Africa as primeval wilderness, a vision that was based on the English aesthetic of the Romantic sublime with its dual impulse: the quest for escape from a fragmenting and morally corrupting capitalist society, and search for the immutable and the transcendent in the 'untouched' landscape of wilderness. Because wild Africa had been the rhetorical ground on which western colonial history had been acted out, the wilderness areas of East Africa, even those confined to national parks, could be imagined as "a savage world at the dawn of civilisation, whose transformation represents the very beginning of the national historical epic" (Cronin 1995: 79-80). National parks in East Africa were, in effect, created out of a romantic desire for untouched wilderness and a colonial desire for a landscape that could still harbour a vision of personal, and perhaps even national, destiny. In this way the wilderness landscape has the potential to 'hold' a type of significance and to solicit a particular way of seeing for those so predisposed, as Mitchell has noted:

Landscape as a cultural medium thus has a double role with respect to something like ideology: it naturalises a cultural and social constructions, representing an artificial world as if it were simply given and inevitable, and it also makes that representation operational by interpellating its beholder in some more or less determinate relation to its giveness as a sight and site (Mitchell 1994: 2)
The national park is a barricade against time's desecrations, it desires to block out history, and to excise or assimilated to an authentic and original 'nature' any sign of human life and labour. Like natural history, wilderness landscape in national parks appears to be a benign and 'natural' feature that is simply 'there'. Its natural appearance deflects the transformative potential of the landscape idea in the colonial context and does not declare its relation to imperialism in a direct way (Mitchell 1994: 10). National parks are cultural and social constructions that, because they appear to be representations of the 'natural' world, are presumed to be spontaneously founded, given and inevitable. It is therefore a type of utopic formation that, as with many of the grand schemes of imperialism, had and still has a distinctly dystopian face to which Neumann's (1995) discussions of the establishment of national parks in the colonial era and their postcolonial histories attest. The wilderness landscape ideal has historically concealed the violence of displacements perpetrated by the colonial state where indigenous people became alienated from their lands.

Largely ignorant of what Mitchell calls the 'hard facts' embedded in idealised settings, the East African national park is a place where visitors can go where time seems to have been abolished, or at least to have been arrested in a kind of continuous originary moment. Here time appears as absolutely manifest; the landscape can be imagined as it always has been, that is, empty and unchanged for millennia. It is therefore a type of landscape commonly understood to be a remnant of time, a moment of an ancient past revealed to us in an ongoing, living present. And so the national park is a place where one can go to escape the modern sense of time as contingent and transitory. In other words, the national park may offer an experience of arrested time, but it can only be inhabited temporarily and only within the circumscribed space of the wildlife sanctuary. Here, it seems, present time has been intercepted, impeded and enclosed. In this sense, then, it offers the traveller an experience of having abandoned the present in a place that can be imagined as outside of time.

One theorist of 'other' spaces was Foucault, whose lecture Des Espace Autres of March 1967 (but published in 1984), offers some intriguing insights into spaces that seem to enclose time or exist outside of time. His particular focus in this lecture is upon sites that have a relation to other sites in a contradictory but relational manner, as he explains.

There are also, probably in every culture, in every civilization, real places - places that do exist and that are formed in the very founding of society - which are something like counter-sites, a kind of effectively enacted utopia in which the real sites, all the other real sites that can be found within the culture, are simultaneously represented, contested, and inverted. Places of this kind are outside of all places, even though it may be possible to indicate their location in reality. Because these places are absolutely different from all the sites that they reflect and speak about, I shall call them, by way of contrast to utopias, heterotopias (Foucault 1986: 24).
According to Foucault, heterotopias are real places. This characteristic distinguishes them from utopias, which are fundamentally unreal spaces (Foucault 1986: 24). More's imagined island *Utopia* (1515-1516) the 'good place' which is nevertheless 'no place' was the originator of the literary discourse of imagined utopias invented for the purposes of social commentary (Goodwin 1982: 31). Many followed More's precedent, possibly to avoid repercussion from the politically transgressive ideas that they expressed, and placed their literary utopias 'elsewhere' for the purpose of a comparison with the 'here'. Plato, Campanella, Bacon, Owen, Fourier and Cabel created 'thought experiments' about ideal forms of social organization figured in the impossible place: the moon or the centre of the earth, the past, the future or in dreams (Parker 2002: 222). It is my contention that national parks are real spaces that function as counter-sites; they may be absolutely different from surrounding land that has been altered by capitalist development, but by virtue of this difference they profoundly reflect and speak about spaces of development. In this sense, national parks can be conceived as a kind of heterotopia.

To understand what kind of heterotopia the national park is, it is useful to look at the metaphors that are often attributed to this western cultural phenomenon. The national park with its endemic flora and fauna is often likened to a botanical garden, which collects in one place exotic plants from all parts of the globe as "a sort of happy, universalizing heterotopia" (Foucault 1986: 26). It is also sometimes compared to a zoological garden, which in similar fashion places 'contradictory' species side by side as part of a collection. Although the figure of the botanical garden and the zoological garden have frequently been used to describe the national park, they are also quite unlike it because these collections speak so clearly of human intervention. What differentiates the national park from these examples is that it is a space that is thought to occur 'naturally'; all the flora and fauna that occupy that topographical terrain have been cordoned off from the 'unnatural' influence of humankind and alien species in the interests of preservation. In this way, the national park and everything within that space is generally thought of as having been spontaneously 'found', rather than having been laboriously collected and arranged.

The collection within the national park, its trees and rivers, its mountains and weather patterns, its species of plants and animals, has come into existence over eons of time. In this enclosed area which is protected by legislation, time continues to accumulate indefinitely. For this reason the national park is rather more like the heterotopia of the museum or library where we also find accumulations of time. In these spaces, Foucault tells us, the endless accretions of past objects and books represents no less than the will to enclose in one place "all epochs, all forms, all tastes" (Foucault 1986: 26). What the national park does share in common with the museum or library is this will to enclose in one place all of time. The national park therefore constitutes a place "that is itself outside of time and inaccessible to its ravages" (Foucault 1986: 26).
Heterotopias are most often linked to slices in time - which is to say that they open onto what might be termed, for the sake of symmetry, heterochronies. The heterotopia begins to function at full capacity when men arrive at a sort of absolute break with their traditional time (Foucault 1986: 26).

The national park is frequently supposed to be an island in time or a vignette of how it was before humans had altered the landscapes apparently permanently (Atkins: 1998: 267). The wilderness landscape of the national park can therefore be described as having two essential characteristics pertaining to time and space. As an 'island in time' it is a place where time is occluded. As a space it declares a relation of difference to other spaces understood to have been altered. It therefore exists both as testament to the past and a relational space of contrast. We can, accordingly, identify national parks as heterotopias particularly of the fourth and sixth type in Foucault’s theoretical outline that are characterised by ruptures of time and space.

The sixth and last trait of the heterotopia in terms of Foucaults discussion is a space that it functions in relation to all the space that remains:

The last trait of heterotopias is that they have a function in relation to all the space that remains. This function unfolds between two extreme poles. Either their role is to create a space of illusion that exposes every real space, all the sites inside of which human life is partitioned, as still more illusory . . . Or else, on the contrary, their role is to create a space that is other, another real space, as perfect, as meticulous, as well arranged as ours is messy, ill constructed, and jumbled. This latter type would be the heterotopia, not of illusion, but of compensation, and I wonder if certain colonies have not functioned somewhat in this manner. In certain cases, they have played, on the level of the general organization of terrestrial space, the role of heterotopias (Foucault 1986: 26).

National parks are heterotopias of the second kind in Foucault’s description. Untouched nature is generally understood a meticulously intricate web of relations figured as an ecosystem. This is a conceptualisation of nature crucially hinged on the notion of balance where all living things co-exist as a harmonious whole. Nature in its ‘natural’ state exists in perfect unity and delicate equilibrium. For this reason we can understand national parks as a space that exists in relation to constructed spaces of capitalist modernity that surround it. Clearly, when nature is enclosed in the form of the preserve the ecosystem is suddenly and artificially truncated at the park boundary, making the balance of nature subject to the combined managerial efforts of scientists, ecologists, vets, and rangers. Wilderness spaces and the species of plants and animals these spaces support are likely to survive in the future "only by the most vigilant and self-conscious management of the ecosystems that sustain [them]" (Cronin 1995: 81-82). Even so, the national park’s apparent naturalness performs a crucial role of compensation in the maelstrom of the modern world because it represents a real space that is “as perfect, as meticulous, as well arranged as ours is messy, ill constructed, and jumbled".
Outside of nature 'unnatural' but apparently 'organic' capital grows wild, especially in urban 'jungles', "whereas it is nature itself that is subject to careful planning and engineering" (Jameson 2004). Part of the planning and engineering of nature has been the identification and legalization of areas of the environment by the West to be protected from commercial exploitation as national parks and reserves, and this is where untouched and uncultivated land is most frequently to be found. While national parks function to preserve the landscape from the destruction of natural habitat through environmental changes associated with development, and to preserve the plants and animals that occur there, they are also preserves of another kind - they preserve an older, perhaps even pre-modern, way of being. For instance, C.S. Stokes expressed a sense of modern alienation in the form of an enforced ‘exile’ from his ‘true’ home in the wilderness in a poem published in his book about the Kruger National Park, Sanctuary:

> The fates relent; from man-made maelstrom free-
> This vortex where, entoiled, too long I’ve dwelt –
> I vision, as the fetters fall from me,
> The exile home-returning to the veld (Stokes 1941: 6).

Harvey and Berman have argued that to be modern is to experience an overwhelming sense of fragmentation, ephemerality and chaotic change (Harvey 1989: 11). Modernity is a maelstrom of change driven by "a drastically fluctuating capitalist market" which gives rise to "changing images of the universe and our place in it, industrialization of production transforming knowledge into technology, creation of new environments and destruction of old ones, new forms of corporate power and class struggle, cataclysmic urban growth, mass communications systems binding the most diverse peoples, bureaucratically structured and increasingly powerful nation states (Berman 1982: 16). This experience of modernity has the potential to unify people across geographical and cultural difference, but it is a condition that arises out of a perpetual sense of chaotic disintegration and renewal, as Berman describes:

> To be modern is to find ourselves in an environment that promises us adventure, power, joy, growth, transformation of ourselves and the world - and, at the same time, threatens to destroy everything we have , everything we know, everything we are. Modern environments and experiences cut across all boundaries of geography and ethnicity, of class and nationality, of religion and ideology: in this sense, modernity can be said to unite all mankind. But it is a paradoxical unity, a unity of disunity: it pours us into a maelstrom of perpetual disintegration and renewal, of struggle and contradiction, of ambiguity and anguish. To be modern is to be part of a universe in which, as Marx said, “all that is solid melts into air” (Berman 1982: 15).

Where once wilderness had been chaotic and threatening, a 'worthless wasteland' redeemable only through development, by the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth-century this conception had fundamentally changed (Cronin 1995: 71). From then on wilderness came to be increasingly conceived as the last refuge from a civilisation, an island in a sea of urban-industrial modernity. But wilderness spaces have become transposed into a commodity whose value can be located in the global market and where nature, like everything else, has become "enterprised up". Even in nature
sanctuaries both nature and personal experience have become part the regime of flexible accumulation that is both "ferociously global and excruciatingly local" (Haraway 1995: 454).

In Foucault's fourth principle, he discusses heterotopias of a type that are arranged predominantly around the axis of time. As an example, Foucault introduces us to the 'vacation village' which are "Polynesian villages that offer a compact three weeks of primitive and eternal nudity to inhabitants of the cities" (Foucault 1982: 26). The Polynesian package for city-dwellers is aligned to the heterotopia of accumulative time in the following way:

The huts of Djerba are in a sense relatives of libraries and museums. For the rediscovery of Polynesian life abolishes time; yet the experience is just as much the rediscovery of time, it is as if the entire history of humanity reaching back to its origin were accessible in a sort of immediate knowledge (Foucault 1986: 26).

It is, Foucault tells us, economically possible to circumvent the present for a three-week period with the purchase of a tourist package. The Polynesian village is a place where visitors can go where time seems to have been abolished, or at least to have been arrested in a kind of continuous originary moment. Visitors can participate in this moment by discarding their clothing and the trappings of modernity in the process. What is distinctive about modernity, Harvey tells us, is that experiences of time, space and causality are transitory, fleeting, fortuitous and arbitrary (Harvey 1989:11). The quest for the past in the present can be regarded as a way of finding respite from this aspect of the ‘modern condition’. Moreover, procuring admission to a Polynesian village one in not only purchase of a warrant to live in another time for a few weeks, but license to transgress the bounds of what is socially and morally permissible in the present because one is temporarily inhabiting an elsewhere in the ‘past’.

The notion that the past can be found in present indigenous cultures such is a temporal figuration that quite common in the twentieth-century. It can be identified in artistic projects related to depicting indigenous cultures perceived as existing outside of contemporary time, such as for example in Mirella Ricciardi’s two year expedition to record East African peoples that resulted in the photographic folio *Vanishing Africa* (1971), or the photographic portraits of Southern Africa peoples of the 1950s by Constance Stuart Larrabee that were understood to be a depiction of "the vanishing cultures of South Africa: the Bushmen, Swazi, Sotho, Ndebele, Zulu, Lovedu and the people of Transkei" (Hoopes 1991: 44). In their projects to capture on camera the ‘vanishing cultures’ of Africa, photographers like Ricciardi and Larrabee were concerned to depict people in ‘traditional’ clothing and environs that would evoke the idea of authentic culture both aesthetically and ‘objectively’ in using a documentary realist tradition (Hoopes 1991: 44). Such photographs commonly set up shots in the ‘manners and custom’ ethnographic style which would include human habitations, cultural artifacts, dress and indeed any material culture of indigenous peoples that could collectively ascribe the people to whom they belong to an idealized realm
of the pure or original culture. The individuals in these portraits are represented as ‘typical’ in the sense that they are shown as exemplars of their race or culture. However, in spite of this typification there always exists a tension between ‘type’ and individual features and personality expressed by the human physiognomy, a tension which seems to lend special poignancy to the image by the implication of such cultures untimely destruction.

The celebration of the culturally pure society as yet untouched by the reach of western value systems or capital is reminiscent of the Rousseauan tradition of the ‘Noble Savage’, a romantic notion generally acknowledged as a response to the rise of industrialism in Europe and associated with the origins of the Western quest for the primitive. Scholars such Torgovnick (1998) have associated the concept of the primitive primarily with non-western peoples perceived as unpolluted by contact with Western civilization. Primitivism itself can be seen as a Western phenomenon of nostalgic longing which regards these ‘primitive’ cultures with a desire, and to find in them ways to rediscover, or emulate and enact what is perceived to be a purer way of life untainted by the strictures of modern industrial society. With the homogenizing and infectious spread of capitalist society, technology and value systems throughout Africa is seen to obliterate all cultural diversity in its path. Conversely, this threatened absence becomes the “very generating mechanism of desire” whose symptom is nostalgic longing (Stewart 1984: 23).

The romance of East African nature promoted by tourist agencies is similarly infused with a desire to experience the primitive on one hand and the retrojective desire to escape an ever dominant present on the other. Foucault’s Polynesian example brings to mind the nostalgic reenactment of an earlier colonial era described in Bruner and Kirshenblatt-Gimblett’s well-known anthropological investigation “Maasai on the Lawn: Tourist Realism in East Africa” (1994). They describe Mayer’s Ranch as a privately owned tourist attraction near Nairobi which features 'tribal' dancing by the Masai followed by tea and scones on the lawn. Here the morans perform an idealized colonial construction of themselves which feature the fundamental tenets of a European idea of the Maasai: "the bravery of the Maasai warrior, the glorification of youth and maleness, Maasai as "Lords of East Africa", cattle raids, lion hunting, male circumcision, the diet of raw foods (milk and blood), the primitive Maasai, the 'natural man' and the affinity between tribesmen and wildlife" (Bruner & Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1994: 437). This tourist facility in Kenya speaks of a desire to appease the modern sense of disorientation or loss with an obsessive urge to discover not an 'authentic' self as one might do in a Polynesian village, but an 'authentic other'. It is a paradoxical exchange in which Maasai pastoralism is sold to tourists as pristine and independent, but the production of this idealized vision depends on Maasai adaptability and their opportunistic interdependence with the ex-British colonial family who run the operation (Bruner & Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1994: 436). It is hinged on the fit between tourist desire for 'natural states' and the performance culture of the Maasai youth. What is more, the performance is acknowledged as a tourist representation by both the Maasai and the
Mayers since it is described as a 'picture' that runs only for the duration of the tourist season. The entire picture is framed by nature because nature "raw, wild, untouched, given" is the motivating force of East African tourism (Bruner & Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1994: 437).

Nature in East Africa has long been coded in ways that remove it from human agency, Bruner and Kirshenblatt-Gimblett argue. The romantic aestheticisation of 'natural man' and the idea of untouched wilderness is here figured in contrast with another key landscape conceptualisation, the colony conjured as British estate. The Mayer's garden is living testament to the colonial aptitude for transformation, for here the African 'wastes' bloom with British flowers (Bruner & Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1994: 438). The gratification to be derived from scones in the colonial garden emerges in the co-mingling of the gracious and the barbarous; the refined ritual of tea is offset against the rude ritual of 'tribal' dancing just as the transplanted lawn and flowers are set against the backdrop of indecorous wilderness. It is a landscape experience of scenic and conceptual contrast in which the tourist is transported back to a period before the independence of Kenya, to an 'other' time and a place 'other' than the present. As eagerly as the city dwellers visit the Djerba to discard their decorum and their clothing in order to embrace their primitive selves, tourists visit to the Mayer's Ranch in order to participate in the civilities of the colonial culture, not only as complaisant guests of the Kenyan settler family, but as patrons of a more 'forgiving' era when hierarchy and paternalism prevailed.

The Mayer's ranch seems to be testament to the productive force with which the colonial position of power is still imagined by western tourists. It also speaks of a desire for an encounter with an 'authentic other'. From between these two positions there emerges what one could call a belated colonialism which "vacillates between an insatiable search for a counterexperience in the Orient and the melancholic discovery of its impossibility" (Behdad 1994: 15). For even while these tourists are immersed in a space marked by clear boundaries and points of reference that propose a temporary re-centering of identity around the axis of an imagined colonial self and the primitive other, this 'experiential theatre' cannot entirely overcome the condition of post-modern, post-colonial self-consciousness. It seems to me that a desire for a past period of Africa has much to do with what one could call the 'romance of Empire'. This is, however, an aspect of British imperialism has generally been passed over as the insufferable pretensions of colonial aggrandisement from which scholarly attention should ironically distance itself. And yet, as Said has pointed out, a proper understanding of imperialism must also take stock of the nostalgia for empire:

A proper understanding of imperialism must take stock also in the present of the nostalgia for empire, that is, you still find it in the writings of French and English historians, for example, who regret the day and the idea that we had to give India up, or that we had to withdraw from Algeria. That still exists. And what also exists is the anger and resentment it provokes, the memory of
empire, in those who were ruled and who see in empire nothing but an unmitigated disaster for the native people (Said 1993: http://www.zmag.org/zmag/articles/barsaid.htm 09.09.06).

The contemporary nostalgia for wild nature seems to be caught up in the fantasies of authentic origins and 'pure' states. But fantasies about origins and pure states are of necessity inhabited by corresponding anxieties about doomed worlds, as Haraway suggests when she says that origin myths long for fulfillment in apocalypse (Haraway 1991: 175).

I am interested in how the elevated Romantic rhetoric of 'noble nature' and desires for 'natural states' came to be applied to the landscapes of East Africa, when, and with what effect. I am therefore interested in an aspect of empire that shows a commitment to imperialism over and above profit. Imperialism cannot be seen as a simple act of accumulation and acquisition, but is rather to be understood as "supported and perhaps even impelled by impressive cultural formations", as Said proposed in a 1993 speech. One of these cultural formations is a romanticisation of African nature and peoples, and it is here where I focus my attention. The intention of my investigation is, in the words of the Comaroffs, "not to diminish the brute domination suffered by the colonised peoples of the modern world, or to deny the Orwellian logic on which the imperial projects have often been founded" but to also to "take in its moments of incoherence, and inchoateness, its internal contortions and complexities . . . [in order] to understand better the forces that, over time, have drawn [the colonizer and the colonized] into an extraordinarily intricate web of relations (Comaroff 1992: 183).

Foucault has broadly suggested that certain colonies may have functioned as heterotopias of compensation, and this is the essence of my argument regarding the wilderness spaces of East Africa. If national parks represent the remnants of a pre-capitalised landscape, then in the context of a widespread and ever-expanding global capitalism, East Africa seems to have become one of the precious repositories of what is commonly conceived to be a universal human heritage. But different cultures view land, and for that matter wilderness and wildlife, in different ways. As Tanganyika’s minister of lands and survey once remarked, “it must, however, be said that the almost mystical and romantic regard for wild animals which some people have, has often puzzled the peoples of Africa” (Neumann 1998:141). Of all inherited colonial institutions, the romantic regard for wilderness and wildlife is often perplexing to those of African culture; there is no simple or unproblematic ‘we’ that corresponds to a universal human spirit seeking harmony in nature (Mitchell 1994: 6). This desire is to be found predominantly the west, and particularly in first world cultures of Europe and America.

The phenomenon of western desire for wilderness and for viewing the wildlife endemic to those landscapes was recognized by Julius Nyerere in his statement about the role of conservation in the newly independent Tanganyika.
I personally am not very interested in animals. I do not want to spend my holidays watching crocodiles. Nevertheless, I am entirely in favour of their survival. I believe that after diamonds and sisal, wild animals will provide Tanganyika with its greatest source of income. Thousands of Americans and Europeans have the strange urge to see these animals (Julius Nyerere quoted in Neumann 1998:144).

Nyere’s metaphor of watching crocodiles - which is really only possible when they are at their most inactive, (i.e. when asleep on sandbanks) - indicates that he personally finds watching wildlife boring, even a waste of time. His main interest in their survival is the potential source of revenue that they represent in terms of foreign exchange related directly to ‘strange urge’ of Americans and Europeans to see wild animals in wilderness surrounds. In American and European cultures this desire arises out of a shared set of social values to which the urge to travel to East Africa to view its wildlife and endemic fauna appears to give cultural expression. I do not attempt to address why this is so in this dissertation so much ask the question of what this desire for and value of pristine wild landscape does.

If national parks in East Africa perform a therapeutic function it is not one aimed at the citizens of that nation but the travelers who come so far to seek landscapes of wilderness and to view the wildlife endemic to those landscapes. Consumption of wild nature appears to be an innocuous cultural phenomenon. It is a powerful market-driven demand that ‘happens’ to be of great economic benefit the countries of East Africa, and in addition includes the happy side effect of contributing to the preservation of nature. However, commentators on the political economy of tourism have recognised that tourism often perpetuates uneven relationships between metropolitan and other cultures. ‘Third World’ countries in Africa are said to have effectively “thrown off the yoke of colonialism and have taken up the yoke of tourism” (Mowforth 1998: 49). According to Mowforth, the global expansion of capitalism has drawn the Third World into increasingly tight relationships with the First World in which tourism, now the largest global industry, has been a significant component (Mowforth 1998: 49). A charge of neo-colonialism has been levied at the relation of dependence between former colonies and the metropolitan centre in the context of tourism in Tanzania:

Since the success of tourism [in Tanzania] depends primarily on our being accepted in the metropolitan countries, it is one of those appendage industries which give rise to a neo-colonial relationship and cause underdevelopment (Mowforth 1998: 49 quoting Shivji, 1973).  

---

6 Dependency theory that emerged in the 1950s showed that underdeveloped countries would always lag behind the west because economic backwardness in the Third World resulted from the presence rather than the absence of
This theory saw underdeveloped states as a prerequisite of capitalism which would perpetuate the exploitation of the natural resources, cheap labour and markets of the peripheral states to the benefit of metropolitan centres.  

Wilderness landscapes of East Africa are highly contested terrains. Post-independence Kenya’s wilderness areas for instance, are plagued by poaching which became so widespread a problem that Kenyatta declared a ban on the trade of ivory and other animal products in December 1977. World Bank funding the following year enabled the creation of a militarised anti-poaching unit, but in spite of this measure by the late 1980s it was evident that much of Kenya’s fauna was facing extinction. According to the Kenya Wildlife Service fifty percent of Kenya’s wildlife had disappeared since the hunting ban in less than in twenty years (Hopcroft 2000: 267). Particularly alarming has been the black rhino population, which over two decades diminished from 20,000 to between 500 and 600 animals in 1985. Kenyatta’s successor, President Arap Moi recognised that along with the loss of a national asset he was also facing a major loss of foreign currency earnings, and he embarked upon an intensive and multi-faceted programme against poaching. On 18 July 1989 he set fire to twelve tons of poached ivory tusks worth in the order of $3 million, and since then the 18th of July has been celebrated annually in that country as ‘Elephant Day’ to generate awareness of and compliance with state conservation objectives. Other measures taken by Arap Moi to stop the slaughter of Kenya’s wild animals included the reorganisation of the Department of Wildlife Conservation and Management and the restructuring of The National Parks of Kenya into Kenya Wildlife Service under the directorship of Richard Leakey. As an additional disincentive to poaching, Arap Moi ordered the country’s security forces to shoot poachers on sight (Ofcansky 2002: 108).

A look at the national parks policy of Tanzania during and after the colonial period reveals an equally contested side to wilderness landscapes in this country. Neumann and Lissu’s studies of East African national parks up to the present reveal what Mitchell has called “a moral, ideological and political darkness that covers itself with innocent idealism". Tanzania is one of Africa’s largest countries with a surface area of over 945 000 km2, but is ranked among the five poorest countries in the world with over half the population living below the locally defined poverty line, roughly equivalent to US$180 per year.
What is considered one of the poorest and most debt distressed countries in the world is also a country that still has one of the most extensive protected areas in Africa accompanied unrivalled wildlife resources (Leader-Williams 2000: 219). Tourism is one of the country’s highest sources of foreign revenue, which is why the state has a vested interest in securing the natural assets that attract tourist dollars to the country. After all, as Garland has pointed out, it is the ongoing physical presence of wild animals in Tanzania that generates their main value, not their export for sale in a distant marketplace (Garland 2006: 49).

Thirteen national parks have been created since independence, and the expansion of protected areas in a country whose population is primarily rural and agrarian has produced a conflicted relation between people and the state. As a 2004 brochure issued by the Director General of Tanzania National Parks to promote tourism declares, "Many locals are employed within the parks by lodges and tour operators - and by TANAPA, particularly in the fight against poachers who desire to steal from the parks for profit or subsistence” (TANAPA 2004: 33). This official statement shows that disciplinary action may be directed at even the poorest level of society to protect the assets of the state. One of the government’s responses to threats targeting the safari industry has been to step up state violence in the name of conservation. Tanzania’s National Parks Agency has created a ‘paramilitary’ unit ‘governed by a paramilitary disciplinary code of conduct’ to defend protected areas against local communities (Neumann 1998: 6). Moreover, the primary resource of recruits for game rangers are people trained in use of weapons and the application of violence – former police, prison, or military state personnel. The result has been a paramilitary style of organization, as Tanzania’s Minister for Natural Resources recognized in the 1960s when he said “the Department has tended to be looked on (and behave) like a Special Police Unit rather than . . . technical advisors on game conservation” (Neumann 2001:307). As had occurred in Kenya, Tanzania’s wilderness spaces have been sites of violent conflict during and after colonial independence because they have historically been resources for survival to which even the poorest communities no longer have legal access. A discussion of the embattled history of the wilderness landscape in Tanzania is the focus of the next chapter, The Contested Landscape.

---

8 Agriculture (46.2%), Mining (2.5%), and Tourism (7.2%) sectors of the economy contributed 55.9% of total Tanzanian GDP in 2004. In addition Trade, Hotels, and Restaurants contributed an additional 11.7% (Garland 2006: 47).
CHAPTER 4:
The Contested Landscape

African Land Recast in a Vision of The Wild Continent

The Imperial project was disposed towards transforming the disordered wilderness into a prospect more pleasing and profitable in which ‘wildness’ became the discursive terrain through which colonialists could enact their mythologised encounters with nature. Said reminds us that the colonial state was established not only under conditions of extreme adversity in which Europeans battled not only "the African wilds or wastes", as he put it, but also an immense numerical disparity where a small number of Europeans a long way from home dominated a much larger number of natives on their home territory (Said 1993: http://www.zmag.org/zmag/articles/barsaid.htm 09.09.06). Berman attempts to address this anomaly by offering two divergent Marxist interpretations of the East African colonial state; either as a potent icon of political domination and structural transformation, or as a paternalistic mediator trying to find legitimacy within the contending interests of colonial society. The ‘strong’ state is the powerful bureaucratic agent of imperialism that through coercion, indirect pressures and material inducements "smashed the self sufficiency of indigenous pre-capitalist societies and managed their subordinate linkages to metropolitan capital". The ‘weak’ state, on the other hand is "constantly strapped for resources, plagued by poor communications and inadequate information, and possessing limited coercive force, it appears as a façade of power sustained by a delicate game of bluff and wit, combining exhortation and threat with the cooption and accommodation of indigenous social forces". Berman sees both positions as equally valid reflections of the reality of the colonial situation in which the state could not rely solely on compulsion, for this would have produced an ungovernable resistance in local peoples, but had to find other means of securing compliance (Berman 1992: 140-141). His main point is that the primary motivation of imperialism may have been accumulation, but it’s essential corollary was the ‘task’ of legitimation.

Berman’s dual interpretation of the colonial state shows a balance of force and consent that is revealing of the internal tensions and contradictory logics of the imperialist vision that gave rise to its unconscionable aggressions, ruthless exploitations and injudicious acts. Rather than reading colonialism in East Africa in terms of a deterministic and unilateral imposition of power, the domination and restructuring of the colony can be seen as having taken place through multiple processes and practices through which a peculiarly East African colonial society came in to being. Bureaucracy was the immediate context in which this society was managed and produced. For this reason it can be considered the principle agency of capitalist projects of social transformation.
In an era of post-war recovery and expansion after 1945 efforts to tie colonial output and trade directly to metropolitan interests became continuous, systematic and focused. This is took the form of a “massive expansion of state intervention and pressure on indigenous African societies to accelerate the penetration and development of capitalist social forces” (Berman 1992: 165). The bounding of East Africa's wild landscapes as national parks seem to have occurred at the very moment that the imposition of modernity by imperial forces was becoming inescapably evident in the years leading up to independence. It was in a climate of intensified capitalist transformation when the culmination of British preservationists’ attempted to "recast the African landscape in the image of their dreams of a wild continent" found fruition (Neumann 1995b: 150).

Both development and preservation were attempts to recast society-nature relations in Africa so as to fulfill the commercial and aesthetic dreams of the European coloniser (Neumann 1995b: 153). As a brief look at the history of relocations and evictions will show, this vision of wild and uninhabited nature in the form of the preserve was in fact a type of nature production. The British imposed upon the colonies not only structures of a capitalist social formation but also various conceptualisations of nature associated with capitalism, one of which being the idea of human separation from and control over nature. In other words, it was an imposition of an idea of wilderness upon the East African landscape that was derived from Europe and in large measure imported from London through the auspices of the Society for the Preservation of the Fauna of Empire (SPFE) (Neumann 1995b: 153).

Certainly the national parks model was agreed upon in London, when the British government invited nations with African colonies or territories to attend the Second International Conference for the Protection of the Fauna and Flora of Africa hosted in the in the Moses Room at the House of Lords on 31 October 1933. By 8 November European powers with African possessions, including South Africa, signed an agreement which remained in force till the 1950s. The establishment of national parks in East Africa largely took place after 1945, but importantly it was at this conference that delegates agreed to a precise definition of the term ‘national park’:

The expression ‘national park’ shall denote an area (a) placed under public control, the boundaries of which shall not be altered or any portion be capable of alienation except by the competent legislative authority; (b) set aside for the propagation, protection, and preservation of objects of aesthetic, geological, prehistoric, historical, archeological, or other scientific interest for the benefit, advantage, and enjoyment of the general public; (c) in which the hunting, killing or capturing of fauna and the destruction or collection of flora is prohibited except by and under the direction or control of the park authorities. In accordance with the above provisions facilities shall, so far as possible, be given to the general public for observing the fauna and flora in national parks (Ofcansky 2002: 84).

According to Neumann the British "transported the English landscape tradition to East Africa" (Neumann 1995b: 153). Neumann is not alone in theorising that the colonialists transported British traditions to East
Africa where these traditions became reinvented. Commentators like Cooper, Stoler and Ranger have made the same claim, albeit regarding aspects of the metropolitan culture other than landscape. Mitchell’s writing, however, is useful in this regard for he has argued that landscape can be seen as the ‘dreamwork’ of imperialism:

Landscape might be seen more profitably as something like the ‘dreamwork’ of imperialism, unfolding its own movement in time and space from a central point of origin and flooding back on itself to disclose both utopian fantasies of the perfected imperial prospect and fractured images of unresolved ambivalence and unsuppressed resistance (Mitchell 1994: 10).

It is my contention that the East African national park can be seen as the actualisation of the ‘dreamwork of imperialism’; national parks were sites of both European utopian fantasies and sites bitter contention, because the vision of nature in African as a pristine, empty wilderness "could only become a reality by relocating thousands of Africans whose agency had in fact shaped the landscape for millennia" (Neumann 1995b: 151). The national park may have been a contested landscape during the period of colonialism, but it has been the subject of bitter contention ever since. How and why the colonial legacy of national parks came to be continued and policed in paramilitary style up until the present day is a question that Neumann addresses in his archival-based studies (1995b, 1998, 2001), where he exposes the ‘hard facts’ embedded in ideal landscape settings (Mitchell 1994: 7).

The ideal settings that I will deal with in this chapter are the enclosed wilderness areas of Tanzania. The country is described in a 2004 brochure issued by the Tanzania’s National Parks Agency (TANAPA) to promote tourism as “a safari destination without peer”:

The statistics speak for themselves: an unparalleled one-quarter of its surface area has been set aside for conservation purposes, with the world-renowned Serengeti National Park and incomprehensibly vast Selous Game Reserve heading a rich mosaic of protected areas that collectively harbour an estimated 20 percent of Africa’s large mammal population (TANAPA 2004: 1).

The ‘dark side’ to these post-colonial wildlife sanctuaries is the escalating state violence that accompanies the policing of the land of national parks and the state-owned assets of these areas, those being the natural fauna and flora of protected areas. Land legally gazetted as wilderness in the form of national parks are the sites of battles for access to resources by peasants, and efforts to control and own natural resources by the state whose administrative arm, the wildlife department, comprised the immediate context in which these struggles over land and land-use occur.

Mitchell has surmised that contemporary discussions of landscape are likely to be contentious and polemical and place the aesthetic idealization of landscape alongside material considerations (as Barrell has done by putting the English landscape movement in the context of the enclosure of common fields
and the dispossession of the English peasantry) (Mitchell 1994: 6). My focus in this chapter on wilderness and intersecting practices of conservation and tourism in Tanzania is in keeping with his assumption. My intention is to present some of the major issues that attend the hugely conflicted terrain of wilderness and wildlife in this country to demonstrate how wilderness has become the most highly contested landscape in East Africa at present because producing such landscapes have meant a significant alteration of land use and land access for Africans living or around national parks and reserves.

Due to space constraints I can only touch on the land disputes inaugurated by colonial-era preservation practices, but using the Serengeti-Ngorogoro case as an example, I will show how these practices, largely perceived as the legacy of colonialism, have been continued in post-independence Tanzania. In a vigorous debate in The Standard lasting three months in mid-1970, a large contingent of Tanzania’s public in this era expressly rejected wildlife preservation as a means to secure economic gain. According to Ofcansky, the readers of the newspaper at this time expressly saw tourism as a form of neo-colonial exploitation. In addition, they descryed the facilities such as luxury hotels, plumbing and medical services provided for tourists that were inaccessible to ordinary Tanzanian citizens (Ofcansky 2002: 110). What is remarkable is that the official stance regarding the Tanzanian tourist industry of the socialist period was that it was designed exclusively for foreign consumption (Honey 1999: 231). The ministry of information at that time explicitly rejected domestic tourism and the utilisation of national parks by its own peoples, announcing in an article published in 1970 that: “we need a socialist discipline to reject the product – tourism - for our own consumption, as much as we do not encourage our women to dangle diamonds” (Honey 1999: 231).

During Tanzania’s socialist period national institutions in the form of its wildlife parks and reserves may have been intended mainly for western consumption, but over time came to strongly symbolise the Tanzanian state itself. The association of the nation with nature, Garland suggests, may have had something to do with the claims to naturalness made by African socialism “in which an imagined, “traditional” realm of pre-colonial African life offered a natural touchstone for Nyerere’s philosophical efforts to forge an ideal, future Tanzanian society” (Garland 2006: 64). However, because the state established itself so emphatically as arbiter and custodian of the type of nature produced by conservation, national parks and reserves have come to symbolise the majesty of the contemporary Tanzanian state more succinctly as symbol of national culture more than any museum or monument:

Where Nigeria has its durbar and FESTAC festival (Apter 2005), and Ghana its public theater (Shipley 2003), Tanzania has the plains of Serengeti, the snow-capped peak of Kilimanjaro . . . the grandeur of Tanzania, the nation at its most majestic and spectacular, is evoked by nothing so much as its natural icons. Interestingly for a nation founded upon the people-centered ideology of African socialism, such natural symbols of the nation are premised on the erasure of people, on the absenting of rural populations from the spaces in question, and on the concealing of the (often substantial) labor necessary to produce them as natural national symbols (Garland 2006: 63-64).
Because national parks and reserves are also spatially and symbolically separated from rural society, conservation areas are effectively transformed into the spaces of the state. Areas previously incorporated into local systems of land use become zones controlled by state bureaucracies instead of according to local needs. After independence the Tanzanian government, assisted by various international organisations and foreign government agencies such as US national Parks Service, declared a further thirteen national parks. Occasionally, as in the case of Arusha National Park, international organisations actually provided the funds to buy the land to be protected. More often, however, the land had already been under some form of state protection inherited from the colonial era (Neumann 1998:145). To demonstrate the remarkable extent to which wilderness has been preserved in postcolonial Tanzania, I have included a current list of that country’s fourteen national parks as published by TANAPA in 2004:

- Mount Kilimanjaro National Park: 755 sq km (292 sq miles).
- Tarangire National Park: 2,600 sq km (1,005 sq miles)
- Lake Manyara National Park: 330 sq km (127 sq miles), of which up to 200 sq km (77 sq miles) is lake when water levels are high.
- Serengeti National Park: 14,763 sq km (5,700 sq miles), Tanzania’s biggest park that also includes the Ngorogoro Conservation Area
- Arusha National Park: 137 sq km (53 sq miles)
- Rubondo Island National Park: 240 sq km (93 sq miles).
- Gombe Stream National Park: 52 sq km (20 sq miles), Tanzania’s smallest park.
- Mahale National Park: 1,613 sq km (623 sq miles).
- Katavi National Park: 4,471 sq km (1,727 sq miles).
- Ruaha National Park: 10,300 sq km (3,980 sq miles), Tanzania’s second biggest park.
- Kitulo Plateau National Park: 442 sq km (172 sq miles)
- Udzungwa Mountains National Park: 1,990 sq km (770 sq miles).
- Mikumi National Park: 3,230 sq km (1,250 sq miles), the fourth-largest park in Tanzania, and part of a much larger ecosystem centred on the Selous Game Reserve.
- Saadani National Park: 1,062 sq km (415 sq miles)

Technically the Serengeti was the only national park declared before independence in 1961, which is why it is the focus of this discussion. However, it must be remembered that many of the national parks listed above had already been under some form of state protection during the colonial era. For instance seven Game Reserves - Lake Natron, Mount Kilamanjaro, Pare, Katavi Plains, Rungwa River and Selous – as well as a number of partial reserves and game control areas were already in existence.
The Serengeti-Ngorongoro region had been recognized as a wildlife area by the German colonial administration in 1907 but was only declared a Game Reserve under the British Game Preservation Ordinance of 1921. In 1928 the Ngorongoro Crater was established as a Closed Reserve where all hunting and cultivation was prohibited by law, with the remainder of the Serengeti-Ngorongoro area being included in 1930. Tourist hunting was at that time openly allowed in game reserves through a license system (Lissu 2002: 12). It was a system easily abused, and hunting for sport assumed such alarming proportions in the Ngorogoro reserve towards the end of the 1930s that the British administration became concerned about the future of the area as a wildlife reserve (Lissu 2002: 12). The final establishment of the boundary of the Serengeti National Park was achieved through a protracted struggle over land rights during the colonial era. To demonstrate this, it is necessary to briefly outline the political standing of Tanganika Territory during the period of British colonial administration, from 1905 to 1961.

Tanganyika Territory had been considered the most ‘wild’ of Britain’s East Africa colonies. By June 1939 there were only 6514 European ‘unofficials’ in the entire country, a number that included 2100 Britons, and 2729 Germans (Iliffe 1979: 303). European settlement was concentrated mainly around the snow-capped Mt. Kilimanjaro and Mt. Meru which “boasted the healthiest climate in the Territory” because the slopes of these mountains were semi-temperate regions (Chidzero 1961: 4). By 1954 this vast country had a railway ‘network’ of three lines which altogether measured 1760 miles, and its road system, which had been under extensive development, boasted only 3506 miles of territorial main road, 3993 miles of local main roads, and 11055 of district roads across the entire Territory (Chidzero 1961: 4-5).

The variable climate, lack of adequate water-supplies, infestation of huge areas by the tsetse fly, and inaccessibility of many regions by normal means of modern transport resulted in about two-thirds of the Territory’s population in one-tenth of the total area, with nearly two-thirds of the country “practically uninhabited” by 1960 (Chidzero 1961: 4). Even so, “practically uninhabited” land that had been visibly settled by African farmers or was less visibly utilized as communal areas of pasture, hunting and other forms of subsistence became, in certain areas, formally gazetted as ‘wilderness’. It was a particular conception of wilderness as empty and ‘pristine’ that required those who did inhabit remote regions to be relocated outside the borders of the national park. The establishment of national parks in colonial Africa often involved “denying a disenfranchised society of peasants and pastoralists access to traditional resources, dislocating land use practices and entire settlements, and thereby threatening the communities’ very existence” (Neumann 1998:122). The transformation of African land rights and land-use practices in the establishment of national parks are what we call could call, after Mitchell, the ‘hard facts’ embedded in idealised settings (Mitchell 1994: 7).
Even before the days of British rule, the widespread perception of Tanganyika Territory was that it was far more trouble than it was worth. In the East Africa Campaign of World War One Tanganyika was the object of bitter fighting between Germany and Britain. The irony of this was not lost on the public, a ‘Jannie In The Jungle’ cartoon published for the enjoyment of Transvaal readers of the Sunday Times and the Sunday Post, attests:

‘Some Colony’:
JCS: Von Lettrow offers to surrender on one condition.
LB: Ja Jannie, en wat is dit?
JCS: That the colony be never given back.
(Lloyd 192?: 30)

As it happened, Von Lettrow did surrender and the colony was never given back to Germany. After the First World War Tanganyika experienced a change of status and came to occupy a particularly anomalous political position. The country was to be to be administrated under what was then a new concept of legal and political authority known as International Trusteeship. The ‘dependent’ Trust Territory of Tanganyika was placed under the Administering Authority of Britain, who in turn was subject to the Supervisory Authority of the United Nations (Chidzero 1961:34-35). Tanganyika was thus answerable to institution a wider international community through this prefectural institution.

Tanganyika’s status as a mandated territory had various long-reaching effects, but one of the most significant was the detrimental influence on the economy; not only was it difficult for potential investors to secure loans but there was little capital available for colonialists to develop resources (Chidzero 1961:73). Because of its lack of infrastructure Tanganyika lacked economic attraction to compare the rest of Britain’s empire and the country was seen largely as a financial liability in relation to the other colonies, particularly Kenya. Certainly throughout much of colonial rule Tanganyika was perceived as being at the bottom of the imperial pecking order, as Illife puts it (Illife 1979: 302):

Its status was in question throughout the interwar period. British imperialists insisted on its retention and German imperialists demanded its return, but statesmen on both sides saw it as a bargaining counter . . . Naturally no bargain resulted but the consequence for Tanganyika was extreme uncertainty as Britain used “every sort of verbal chinoserie to get out of making . . . an announcement that Tanganyika will remain under British administration”. In 1933, 1936 and 1938, businessmen interested in Tanganyika panicked, and it was widely held that uncertainty deterred investors (Illife 1979: 302).

The fear that Tanganyika’s status was only temporary drove away foreign investments (Chidzero 1961:47-48). An overview of Tanganyika’s interwar economy shows stagnation following the war, quite rapid growth in the later 1920s, collapse between 1929 and 1932, and then a faltering recovery (Illife 1979: 301). It was only after the Second World War, when the question of self government suddenly assumed a new importance, that a bolder economic, social and political programme was adopted. In response to
political currents of the day, including an increasingly vociferous criticism of colonial policy, Britain adopted a new approach as is described by the Secretary of State in the Colonies in 1943:

We are pledged to guide Colonial people along the road to self-government within the framework of the British Empire. We are pledged to build up their social and economic institutions, and we are pledged to develop their natural resources (Chidzero 1961:19-20).

The control and development of natural resources in Tanganyika was a much contested issue in the colonial era, but continues to be an area of conflict of the post-colonial state, as I will now go on to examine in more detail.

**The Segregation of Wild Land: A Border War**

The national parks of Tanganyika were devised within a particular a vision of nature symptomatic of the capitalist social formations, namely that nature be separated from humans and human labour. This conceptualisation gave rise to landscapes of development and preservation that were not only geographically segregated, but also visually, conceptually and symbolically segregated. Of course, the spectre of segregation is a familiar one in colonial Africa, where there had long existed policies designed to effect geographic segregation based on the grounds of racial difference as is evident from the separate development of apartheid South Africa. Another notorious example of segregation with far reaching effects was the creation of Native Reserves and areas of European settlement in Southern Rhodesia, now Zimbabwe (Chidzero 1961:223). In Kenya we also find examples of 'Native Lands' set aside specifically for African settlement and administrated by the Native Lands Trust Board (Chidzero 1961:224). In Kenya there existed two forms of administratively rigid and legally-sanctioned reservations of lands, namely 'Native Lands' and 'Crown Lands'.

Crown lands were set aside for indigenous peoples under the Crown Lands Ordinance within an array of categories: the Native Reserves, Temporary Native Reserves, Native Settlement Areas, Native Leasehold Areas and so forth. The White Highlands were originally part of the Crown Lands but after 1908 became exclusively reserved for white settlement. This came into effect not by legal provision, for there was no statutory racial bar preventing non-Europeans from buying land in the temperate Highlands, but it was, administratively speaking, a 'traditionally' white area (Chidzero 1961:224). It was populated mainly by British patricians as a result of a Settlement Scheme that had been introduced on completion of the railway from Mombassa to the interior in 1901, but in 1912 Kenya was still heralded as the ideal home for aristocratic emigrants (Cannadine 1990: 439).

Some of the inhabitants of the Highlands were acutely class and race conscious. Lord Errol's Muthega Club for instance, the focus of a notorious section of the Highlands community known as the 'Happy Valley' set,
was known to have conscientiously barred colonial administrators, businessmen and Jews (Cannadine 1990: 441). Evelyn Waugh defended the attempts of a displaced British peerage to recreate the English landed estate in the Highlands of Kenya in his book about travels in East Africa, Remote People (1931):

"[T]o transplant and perpetuate a habit of life traditional to themselves, which England has ceased to accommodate - the traditional life of the English squirearchy . . . One may regard them as Quixotic in their attempt to recreate Barbetshire on the equator, but one cannot represent them as pirates and landgrabbers" (Evelyn Waugh 179, 183 – 185 quoted in Cannadine 1990: 442).

We see in the Kenyan Highlands a revival of British values of chivalry and honour associated with what Ranger calls the 'refeudalised country house', one of various neo-traditional inventions of identity that became imported into the African colony (Ranger 1993: 63). Kenya’s appeal as a destination lay predominantly in its wild aspect; the British aristocracy "saw in its remote, unspoilt recesses their last hope - where towns and industry were non-existent, where hierarchy and paternalism prevailed, where the ancient values of chivalry and honour were still preserved, and where there was a feeling of escape from the furies of modern life - disillusion, doubt, democracy" (Cannadine 1990: 384). The wildness of East Africa, its lack of development and infrastructure was the basis of its appeal to the European imagination within the dual formulation associated with the wilderness ideal - quest and escape. The evidence of this imaginative appeal can be seen not only in the burgeoning safari industry after 1909, but also in its symbolic representation in the national park:

National parks were at once symbolic representations of the European vision of Africa and a demonstration of the colonial state’s power to control access to land and natural resources. The natural resources of the colony were claimed for the Crown, hence nature protection and the legitimisation of political claims were closely linked. This linkage was symbolically demonstrated by such means as recounting the moral example of the king and queen’s hunting trip to East Africa and the coordination of Serengeti national Park’s christening with the queen’s coronation celebrations (Neumann 1998: 129) (Neumann 1995b: 155).

The politics of aligning the Serengeti Park’s christening with Queen Elizabeth’s coronation celebrations on 2 June 1953 must be understood in relation to the status of Tanganyika Territory in which the Serengeti lay. Previous to the mandate system of 1919, there were only two types of British dependent territories. The first type of dependent territory exemplified in East Africa is the colony of Kenya, which constituted part of the Queen’s dominion as an annexed possession of the Crown whose inhabitants were British subjects. The second type was the protectorate of Uganda, which was acquired by treaty. For all practical purposes, the Ugandan protectorate was governed like a colony, and there was little administrative difference between them, but since it was not an annexed possession of the crown its inhabitants were not British subjects (Chidzero 1961: 39). With the inauguration of the mandate system of the League of Nations a third type was added, the mandated territory. Tanganyika was acquired by the British in 1919 under international law and was to be governed and administered in terms of the international treaty. For
internal constitutional purposes it fell into the same category as protectorates, but its inhabitants were not British subjects but British Protected Persons and enjoyed the same rights as citizens (Chidzero 1961: 40) (Iliffe 1979: 247). Each of these states differed legally in their respective constitutional status and relationship to Britain.

Both the British Mandate for East Africa of 1922, and the Tanganyika Trusteeship Agreement of 1946 placed definite limitations on the powers of the British Crown in Tanganyika Territory (Chidzero 1961:43). Britain had "full powers of legislation and administration" but was bound to promote "the material and moral well-being and social progress of [the] inhabitants", which included the abuse of African land rights (Iliffe 1979: 247). The proposed alignment of the christening of the Serengeti National park with the Queen's coronation shows the link between nature protection and the legitimation of the British state, as is symbolised in the figure of the British monarch. Neumann's statement that the natural resources of the colony were claimed for the Crown is rather too broad and requires qualification in the context of Tanganyika Territory and the influence of international trusteeship. Tanganyikan land was not Crown land in the sense of land annexed by the British Crown but rather land held in trust for the peoples of Tanganyika under international law. The right of domain was not vested in the British crown, but in the territory itself. All land in the Tanganyika Territory, excepting freehold land acquired before 1923 was deemed 'public land', that is, as belonging to the people of Tanganyika (Chidzero 1961: 225-226). The natural resources of Tanganyika, including mineral rights, were managed by the British state apparatus on behalf of the Tanganyikan peoples, a situation which indeed amounted to a proprietary right, for the state held all legislative and discretionary powers which it could exercise at will. This was the core weakness of the mandate that had been in place since 1922, for it was based on "an old fashioned document embodying pre-war safeguards against colonial abuses but containing no provision for enforcement against a recalcitrant mandatory" (Iliffe 1979: 247). In other words, it was a kind of altruistic 'gentleman's agreement' between the Allied powers that had made no proviso for the violation of its terms. Britain therefore did not have sovereignty over Tanganyika but was made internationally accountable, and this meant that she was cautious about circumventing the terms of the mandate.

At the Peace Conference of 1919 the area of German East Africa that had been under British occupation defined the new boundaries of Tanganyika, and over this vast area Britain was given full powers of legislation and administration (Iliffe 1979: 246-247). The war had largely wiped out the political changes which the Germans had imposed and in doing so facilitated the Indirect Rule policies which the British introduced in 1925 (Iliffe 1979: 254). Indirect rule was described as ‘the progressive adaptation of native institutions to modern conditions’ but was not really designed with the intention of furthering the cause of self-government. It was in fact adopted for reasons of expediency – as a cheap and easy method for local administration to make use of already existing African lines of authority in the East African colonies.
in a context of massive numerical disparity. Once established, however, its proponents tended to lay claim to virtues never anticipated, as Chidzero points out:

Lord Lugard and Sir Donald Cameron, to mention only two of the major British proponents of the system in Africa, lauded it to the extent which gave it an aura of infallible political dogma. Indirect rule grew to be regarded as the only proper and constructive way to govern native peoples. It was regarded as the perfect method to train them in the art of ‘self-government’. Thus it passed from being a function of administrative convenience to an important principle of colonial policy, until it finally became accepted as an indispensable aspect of British trusteeship (Chidzero 1961: 16-17).

Indirect rule was effectively a method of ‘divide and rule’ that kept African political and social forces fragmented, isolated and contained within the framework of local administrative units, which inhibited the coalescence of national resistance to the colonial order (Berman 1992: 162).

Because Britain’s land policy had to conform to the requirements of international trusteeship in Tanganyika, and be protective of native land rights and interests, the Kenya and Tanganyika were conceived rather differently. Sir Donald Cameron, the Governor of Tanganyika (1925-1931) was critical of Kenya which he called the "Great White State', while Tanganyika was seen as "primarily a black man's country". This last was a sentiment that expressed itself in the doctrine of paramountcy of native interests that held sway in the Tanganyika Territory over the period of colonial occupation before 1945 (Iliffe 1979: 262) (Chidzero 1961:71). This presented the British with an insuperable problem: according to the mandate they had to safeguard native lands and interests on the one hand, and to develop the Territory economically which would necessitate land alienation on the other (Chidzero 1961:233). The latter objective seems to have prevailed for, in spite of his liberal views and endorsement of the paramountcy doctrine Sir Donald Cameron, after having secured the permission of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, began what he called "my policy of alienating land where it was available" (Chidzero 1961:226). His reason for doing so was expressed in both terms of the 'capital desire' of European enterprise and the concomitant incapacity of Africans to transform the land:

There are certain agricultural processes which European enterprise and capital can undertake but which are beyond the capacity of the African tribesmen and will be beyond their capacity for a long time to come. If land is available and European enterprise and capital desire to undertake those processes then, in my view, it is directly contrary to the interests of the country as a whole and for the Government to refuse to admit that enterprise and capital and attempt to hold the land under a dead-hand (Chidzero 1961:226).

Land held under a dead-hand is an archaic expression referring to land that is held not by personal ownership, but by an organization such as a church, or foundation or trust out of which there will be no inheritance. Cameron is proposing that the land not merely be held in trust on behalf of the peoples of Tanganyika, but actively developed for the benefit of those for whom it is ultimately intended. Cameron's
argument for land alienation shows that he saw native agriculture as largely ineffectual in comparison to advanced European methods of development, and considered that land in the hands of white farmers would provide an example that might exhort indigenous peoples to work in 'improved' ways (Chidzero 1961:227).

Land alienation was in any event seen as inevitable if the development objectives of the colonial state were to be met. Article 10 of the trusteeship agreement required Britain to develop the economy of the country which required the alienation of land for public works and various agricultural and industrial projects under a system of private enterprise, giving rise to a fundamental conflict between an obligation to protect land rights of native inhabitants and British obligations and desires to develop the territory (Chidzero 1961:233). Sir Andrew Cohen, British Delegate to the trusteeship Council put the matter this way:

On the one hand, they press us to proceed with economic development. They press us, quite rightly, to proceed with the expansion and improvement of education, which itself depends on economic development. But some of them say also: but you must not alienate land except in the most exceptional circumstances. Here is a contradiction and a dilemma. A great deal can be achieved by peasant farming, but this, as I have said, can be supplemented by plantation agriculture, by mining and secondary industries - all of which require alienation of land. Since it is non-Africans who possess the capital and skill to undertake large scale industrial and agricultural projects, land alienation means, in effect, the grant of more leaseholds to non-Africans (Chidzero 1961:234).

Thus the drive for capitalist development and the perceived inadequacy of rural farming techniques provided the reasoning behind the necessity of land alienation, and the example set by Cameron’s alienation policy would roughly remain throughout the inter-war years. After the Second World War, however, Tanganyika saw a "second colonial occupation" of intensified capitalist development (Iliffe 1979: 436). The 'manifesto' of the British state was the Colonial Development Welfare Act of 1940 which provided imperial finance for long term development plans motivated both by a mixture of self-interest and altruism in which British Conservative and Labour parties were committed to capitally invest in the idea of guiding colonial peoples along the road to self-government (Iliffe 1979: 436). This era of colonial development saw a massive expansion of the scale and complexity of the bureaucratic apparatus of the colonial state, according to Berman:

With its graded hierarchy of permanent professional officials, functional specialization of units, and emphasis on ‘disinterested’ expertise and the rational calculation of means and ends, bureaucracy is the principal expression of the drive to increasing instrumental control over social structures and practice. At the same time, far from being a neutral instrument, bureaucracy increasingly comprises the immediate context of the real crisis and struggles of social life. Classes confront each other within and through bureaucracies in both state and capital. The specific forms of the bureaucratic state apparatus have been determined by the tasks of reproduction/accumulation
and control/legitimacy in the context of particular historical forces that subject the abstract 'logic' of capital to the realities of the state (Berman 1992: 143).

In British East Africa new institutions and policies were put in place and technical and specialist agencies proliferated in order to manage the "rural development programmes, commodity marketing boards, investment incentive schemes for metropolitan and international industrial capital, wage and labour stabilization policies, and expanded investment in social and economic infrastructure" (Berman 1992: 166).

Not only did capitalist development become more systematic and focused on commodity production, but Tanganyika's post war development was of a specifically colonial kind. In other words, it was export-orientated development that favoured metropolitan interests and to which an estimated quarter of all productive activity was devoted (Iliffe 1979: 470). In addition to the onset of intensified capitalist production in the post-war period, British land policy changed. The doctrine of 'multi-racialism' became officially applicable to Tanganyika in 1952 and was intended as a safe guard for such minority groups such as European settlers. The paramountcy doctrine that had prevailed in previous years was abandoned in a post-war climate which feared the growing influence of Africans in the political and administrative machinery of the country (Chidzero 1961:187, 185). Along with the shift from 'the paramountcy of native interests' to the concept of 'multi-racialism', came a shift away from the protection of native land interests to increased alienation of land for productive purposes (Chidzero 1961:229).

The 'multi-racial' policy with its implications of inter-racial partnership that prevailed in the tumultuous decade prior to independence involved the recognition of minorities rather than the protection of individual citizens. As political organization among Africans gained greater articulation and strength, and with the formation of the Tanganyika African National Union (TANU) in 1954 which led to fears nationalist consolidation behind a single party, 'multi-racialism' can be understood as an imperialist device for delaying the advent of rule by the African majority (Chidzero 1961:185). Indeed, TANU recognized this and rejected minority rule and the whole concept of multi-racialism which it saw as specious device to allow the minority to continue in a privileged position of control. TANU also rejected the slogan of 'equal rights for all civilized men' that was generally espoused by Europeans in East Africa of the time and proposed instead the slogan of 'equal rights for all men' (Chidzero 1961:197). The European slogan was explicitly racist, for who exactly would constitute the civilized man was, of course, a question from which white people would 'naturally' be exempt.

The slogan 'equal rights for all civilized men' proposed an unequal franchise based once upon a long-standing European myth - the epic story of progress from savagery to civilization. It speaks of "the inexorable, if always incomplete, advancement of the primitive: of his conversion to a world religion, of
his gradual incorporation into civil society, of improvement in his material circumstances, of the rationalization of his beliefs and practices" (Comaroff & Comaroff 1993: xii). But this phrase 'equal rights for all civilized men' simultaneously reveals the myth as flawed, for it presumes an uneven application of modernisation across the indigenous population in which some are presumed to have remained behind and are therefore considered 'uncivilized'. It was on the basis that certain peoples of African descent who were 'less civilised' than others should be excluded from the right of franchise.

Whilst embarking on the elevation and education of a 'modernised' African society, which was intended to include administrative elite trained in the art of self-government, there occurred a concomitant romanticisation of 'pre-European' African society:

At the risk of oversimplifying British views of African culture, two ideological currents, sometimes merging but more often flowing in counter-fashion, can be highlighted. On the one hand there was a romanticisation of a pre-European African society which included ideas of moral innocence, a respect for African bush-skills, and a generalised notion of the noble savage, a mythological construction which Europeans evoked repeatedly in colonialist encounters with India, Africa and the Americas. On the other hand, there was the modernising mission . . . whereby Africans would be freed from their backwardness and become efficient producers within the sphere of the British colonial economy (Neumann 1995b: 151).

Neumann has argued that it is the former view that has prevailed in the mind of the colonial preservationist in East Africa, in which certain indigenous peoples, as long as they conformed to an European vision of 'the primitive', were allowed to remain within protected areas of East Africa's National Parks (Neumann 1995: 160). Like the Pygmies of Parc National Albert, who were considered part of the natural fauna and so allowed to remain within its borders, the Maasai were "imagined to be living more or less harmoniously with nature because they were nomadic, did not hunt, and generally did not cultivate" and were thus able to remain within the Serengeti national park (Neumann 1995: 160).

Maasai could be incorporated into the park so long as they remained within the bounds of what Europeans considered traditional, which meant that they were restricted to carrying spears, swords, clubs, bows and arrows. The Maasai had been considered problematic in that they were difficult to tax or administrate because of their nomadic and pastoralist ways had long been encouraged by the administration to settle and cultivate. When they did indeed cultivate within the Ngorogoro crater the National Parks Director argued that they had here become 'much adulterated with extra-tribal blood' and this perceived impurity, signaled by a deviation from tradition, provided the basis for the motivation for their eviction (Neumann 1995: 160). Another point of struggle between parks officials and the Maasai was their use of fire to open up areas of forest for high-quality grazing, a practice outlawed by the 1940 Game Ordinance which park administrators were nevertheless unable to stop. Through these two examples Neumann demonstrates that the preservationists of the colonial era in East Africa invented Maasai
tradition as the need arose, banning some practices and thereby halting any economic development and cultural change in order that they conform to European visions of primitive Africans 'living amicably amongst the game'.

The Maasai eviction from the Serengeti was based on converging ideas of 'pure' race and 'original' nature, the evidence for which was predicated on assumptions of traditional pastoralism. The colonial administrator's attributed what they considered to be non-traditional practices to twin corrupting influences of pollution where Maasai cultivation in the Ngorogoro area was attributed to racial 'adulteration' by 'extra-tribal blood'. At the same time, racial purity was threatened by the corrupting influence of modernity. In this way the rhetoric of 'spoiled' and 'despoiled' nature that dominated ideas the landscape ideal of wilderness were echoed in the in ideas about African peoples who, it was imagined, occupied a state of nature.

Africans were imagined as either 'spoiled' or unspoiled' like the nature they signified. Spoiled nature could not relieve decadence, the malaise of the imperialist and the city dweller, but only presented evidence of decay's contagion, the germ of civilisation, the injection that was obliterating the Age of Mammals. And with the end of that time came the end of the essence of manhood, hunting (Haraway 1989: 53).

Only Maasai who could be thought of as a 'pure' race living in an 'original' way with nature avoided eviction from national parks in the colonial era.

A discussion of land evictions from wilderness areas demonstrate how the denial of human history and agency are tied to the European idea of wild nature. This is a conceptualisation that persists in East African landscapes that have been developed for mass consumption under capitalism even after the colonial era. The two largest relocations, both in terms of population numbers and geographic extent, took place during the colonial period to facilitate the creation of reserves – around Selous and Serengeti. During the 1930s and 1940s dozens of villages and about 40,000 people were resettled outside the boundaries of what eventually became the Selous Game Reserve in order to facilitate tax collection, disease control, wildlife control, and peasant crop production (Neumann 2001: 308). Relocations from reserves had to be very carefully deliberated by the colonial government because of the supervision of the Permanent Mandates Commission and the United Nations Trusteeship Council which became increasingly vigilant after World War Two. International issues of the day – the 'cold war', the surge of anti-colonialism and the militant nationalist movements – caused these organisations to approach the matter of British Trusteeship with an attitude of “intense political concern” (Chidzero 1961:33). Delegations to Tanganyika to investigate whether African rights were being respected placed pressure on the colonial government to act within the rule of law. Because all changes in land occupation were
conducted through the local Native Authorities as part of the Colonial Office’s policy of indirect rule, evictions had to appear consensual or to be motivated in terms of a greater moral purpose.

In the case of Selous, the principle justification for the eviction of 40,000 people was the control of sleeping sickness. As a result, their resettlement was officially undertaken for the improvement of the health and welfare of the residents of the territory rather than wildlife conservation (Neumann 2001:310). The Serengeti relocations were much more difficult to justify, and evacuation eventually took place on the basis of an agreement whereby the Maasai would remove themselves in exchange for being allowed to occupy the Ngorogoro Crater area, which was excised from the park and gazetted as a “Conservation Area” that accommodated customary land uses (Neumann 2001:310). The British colonial administrators gazetted the area as a wildlife reserve and it was declared a national park - part of the greater Serengeti National Park - in 1940 (although the final boundaries were only finalized in 1951). The western part of the Serengeti National Park was to be designated an exclusive wildlife protection area; while the eastern highlands and adjoining plains including three craters were to form the Ngorongoro Conservation Area. Here the interests of wildlife conservation were to be reconciled with the rights of the Maasai pastoralists in a multiple land use context.

The methods that the colonial state employed to obtain the consent of the Maasai to vacate from the Serengeti National Park were certainly dubious, and although colonial records appear as if it were a compromise approved by the Maasai, the decision was affected under pressure from international conservation interests and the colonial administration. Later interviews of Maasai elders reveal violence orchestrated by police and park wardens against the community in the run up to their eviction, and one of the signatories of the Agreement informed Lissu that they had been in effect issued with an ultimatum which they could either sign or face being forcibly evicted (Lissu: 2000 http://www2.warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/law/elj/lgd/2000_1/lissu/ 01.06.06). With the removal of the Maasai from most of the Serengeti, parks officials felt that they were “eliminating the biggest problem they faced”, but in actual fact the ‘problem’ had been merely displaced to another area (Honey 1999: 224).

The post-independence government also found it expedient to move peoples from within reserve areas. By 1961, the year of independence, laws that prohibited residence in national parks and outlawed most hunting practices were in place, and a great deal of pressure and support from well-organised and highly motivated international conservationists was aimed at newly formed African governments to maintain these laws. At the same, Tanganyika embarked upon a comprehensive programme to modernize the economy which justified a range of policies meant to alter rural economies and land use patterns. One of these policies was enacted on a massive scale in 1974 through ‘Operation Vijiji’, a government initiative to resettle eight million peasants into villages (Neumann 2001: 312). The objective of this operation was to
concentrate peasant populations in order to facilitate rural development. In the case of the Serengeti, these relocations coincided with the drive to create a tourist industry to bring in foreign exchange. Nyerere supported the removal of peoples from near Serengeti National Park because this was consistent with the objectives of the government’s villagisation policy. When touring the area in 1963, the president instructed the local authorities to collaborate with the National parks scheme to remove two hundred thousand households and resettle them near the park boundary (Neumann 2001: 313).

During the colonial era, when about 1000 Maasai and 50,000 livestock moved from Serengeti National Park to the Ngorogoro Conservation Area in 1958, they were granted wide powers of control over the use of natural resources by the Board of Trustees of the National Parks. However, in years to come conservationists and administrators would gradually encroach upon the land and resource rights of this community. Historically, relocations for the development of national parks and reserve had occurred in much of colonial Africa, but Neumann’s study of conservation practices from the colonial era to the present has led him to conclude that geographical displacements of populations for the purposes of wildlife conservation has been ongoing and progressive since independence. He notes that as state conservation laws and policies change they tend to limit peasant’s access to livelihood in and around protected areas, each time effecting a permanent, incremental loss (Neumann 2001: 321). For instance, after the Masai were relocated to the NCA, the colonial government pledged that they would be "permitted to continue to follow or modify their traditional way of life subject only to close control of hunting". Instead, they have over the years lost access to grazing areas in the highland forests, the Oldupai Gorge, Laetoli Site and the Ngorongoro Crater because the effect of cattle grazing in these areas is seen to endanger the conservation value of the land. This land is ostensibly a multiple land use area where Maasai pastoralists have a legal right but conservation administrators have imposed of bans on subsistence practices to the detriment of this and other communities.

Post independence policies were deployed by a bureaucratic structure that concentrated authority and revenue at the top echelons of state officialdom continued to perpetuate mass relocations from new parks. At the same time, national parks have become increasingly militarized in their patrolling and anti-poaching techniques (Honey 1999: 226). Neumann and Lissu argue that there is evidence that the violence of dislocations in the interests of wildlife conservation has increased during the postcolonial period. In a 1974 case the the Maasai pastoralists who had been legally resident in Ngorogoro Crater Conservation Area (NCCA) under the 1958 Agreement were forcibly evicted by the post-colonial government’s paramilitary Field Force Unit (FFU) without notice. Eviction of the inhabitants and their cattle was immediate, with no explanation and no arrangements made for their re-settlement (Neumann 2001: 313). This is a continuation of what Neumann has aptly called ‘conservation without representation’, where the Maasai pastoralists have not been consulted or allowed to participate in
decision-making. Regarding the legal rights of the Ngorogoro Conservation Area pastoralists, Lissu asserts that the exercise of governmental and police powers by the post-colonial Conservation Administration has been in flagrant violation not just of recognised legal agreements but of the basic human rights of the Maasai:

Under the guise of law enforcement by the Authority’s dreaded ... wardens allegedly to curb illegal cultivation and grazing ... [the MNR wardens] have subjected the local community in the NCA to punitive expeditions ... resulting in loss of human life and property; violation of right to livelihood [through denial of grazing and access to water sources and salt licks for cattle] and liberty [through illegal incarceration and restriction of movement of the pastoralists by agents of the Authority] (Lissu: 2000 http://www2.warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/law/elj/lgd/2000_1/lissu/01.06.06 quoting a study by Shivji and Kapinga (1997))

Neumann’s contention is that violence against people is “perpetually latent” in the practices of state-directed wildlife conservation in Africa because European hunting and wildlife conservation efforts had always been closely associated with military activities.

There are historical precedents for the shooting of poachers in the colonial era. For instance, in the 1940s when the Waikoma lost their traditional hunting grounds in the Seregeti they told European game rangers that they would continue to hunt regardless of legal restraint and threatened to use poison arrows against anyone trying to stop them. As a result a number of Waikoma hunters were been killed by African game scouts armed with guns by the 1950s, as the warden explained:

From time to time Game Scouts have had to shoot and kill poachers in the Serengeti National Park. The cause of these regrettable incidents has been the use of poisoned arrows. The poachers have threatened or actually fired arrows at the Scouts. The Scouts, knowing that they dare not risk getting so much as a scratch from an arrow, have to fire instantly (Neumann 2001: 319).

Neumann argues that both colonial and post-independent state control over resources such as wildlife is inherently conducive to violent exchanges because conservation laws reduce access to a source of nutrition without providing an alternative (Neumann 2001:307). The results of the militarization of conservation has been increasing violence directed at the peasants inhabiting villages around national parks, and several legal cases exist to substantiate the point. Incidents in the Ngorogoro Conservation Area include an August 1993 shooting of a Maasai villager, Ekesengei Maandalo, by a squad of seven game wardens known as the ‘Irmelili Killing’ and a March 1997 incident known as the Nainokanoka Confrontation in which three herdsmen, Ringoine Sepeu, Parkepu Kasale and Singore Lemailoya, were severely assaulted by ten NCCA rangers who also slashed their cattle with machetes (Neumann 2001: 314) (Lissu: 2000 http://www2.warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/law/elj/lgd/2000_1/lissu/01.06.06).

Final examples come from an unpublished essay written by a Tanzanian lawyer belonging to an organization called Lawyer’s Environmental Action team (Lissu 1999). The essay was written to the Tanzanian press in response to the reported executions [of a group of villagers] in the Serengeti . . .
...and provides a response to a litany of recent state violence in the name of conservation. Rangers at the Katavi National Park were taken to court in 1998 for shooting three children herding cattle outside the boundary in an area designated for park expansion. At Lake Manyara and Tarangire National Parks, Lissu was part of a research team commissioned to investigate the potential for community-oriented conservation. In the process, they uncovered widespread complaints of beatings perpetrated by Tanzania National Parks (TANAPA) wardens against villagers (Neumann 2001:313).

Lissu argues that wildlife conservation policies are dominated by the 'old orthodoxy' which separates man from his natural environment, as is demonstrated by the laws and conservation practices which have been pursued over the years in the Ngorongoro Conservation Area. These, he says, have not only undermined the security of land and resource tenure of the Maasai pastoralists but threaten the future of wildlife itself in the area. It is his contention that losses of key wildlife species have continued unabated, and that although this is often been blamed on illegal poachers from outside the protected areas, evidence from the NCA suggests it is a problem in some degree caused by poachers internal to the game conservation system. These are hardly ever caught and if caught, they are hardly ever prosecuted (Lissu: 2000 http://www2.warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/law/elj/lgd/2000_1/lissu/01.06.06). Lissu contends that state centred conservationism in Tanzania has had nothing to do with sound wildlife management but instead has facilitated the growth of networks of patronage, favouritism and grand corruption involving high level leaders and public servants whose involvement in corrupt practices is a direct result of monetary greed (Lissu: 2000 http://www2.warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/law/elj/lgd/2000_1/lissu/01.06.06 quoting the Warioba Commission Vol. 1:5).

With the emergence of organized, trans-national networks of illegal trade in elephant ivory and rhino horn driven by international demand in the 1980s, there was a significant escalation in state directed violence (Neumann 2001: 320). In a response to a series of aerial censuses of that indicated a steep decline in elephant populations directly resulting from illegal commercial hunting, state agencies involved in conservation developed an explicitly military style. A clear demonstration of military power was the launch of the Tanzanian government’s ‘Operation Uhai’ in 1989. At a cost of $14,000 a day, it was intended to clamp down on heavy poaching of elephants which had declined by one hundred thousand in just over ten years, from 184,842 in 1977 to 87,088 in 1989 (Ofcansky 2002: 111). It was also an opportunity for the Tanzanian government to demonstrate to their own peoples but also to the international community at large their firm commitment to wildlife conservation at a time when elephants were being proposed for listing Appendix 1 of CITES (Leader-Williams 2000: 224-225).

‘Operation Uhai’ anti-poaching operation was carried out by the combined forces of the Wildlife Department, Tanzania People’s Defence Forces and the police which lasted six months and saw approximately 2,500 people arrested (Neumann 2001: 321). In announcing the campaign, the Minister of Home Affairs was quoted in the Tanzania Sunday News on the fourth of June 1989 as saying that poachers
were enemies of the nation because their activities “greatly interfere with our efforts to revive the economy” and urged citizens to cooperate with the operation (Neumann 2001: 321).

Through his studies of East African national parks in colonial and post-colonial periods, Neumann came to the conclusion that there has been an overall escalation of violence in recent years. In July 23, 1998 The Guardian newspaper carried an article that alleged that game rangers had killed fifty villagers in the Serengeti National Park. A Member of Parliament (MP) from Tarine in Mara Region alleged that a group of villagers who were suffering from a famine that had gripped Mara Region in 1997 entered the park armed with bows and arrows in search of small game. They were discovered by park rangers, who, rather than turning the suspects over to the local magistrate “lined up the suspects and shot them,” the MP said. The bodies were disposed of in the Mara River and the rangers involved transferred to other duty stations. In the article, the MP placed the responsibility of the murders on a former Minister of Natural Resources and Tourism who had issued a shoot-on-sight directive to rangers in 1997 that had been issued in response to an increase in violent robberies of foreign tourists in Tanzania’s lucrative ‘northern circuit of wildlife parks (Neumann 2001: 305). Incidents like these have led Neumann to conclude that violence around national parks has increased.

[I]n the course of writing I have found sufficient evidence to conclude that, in the postcolonial period, all categories of violence have increased in frequency and intensity. Admittedly, given the paucity of reliable documentation, it is difficult to quantify this trend. Nevertheless, the postcolonial state has implemented wildlife conservation policies using means that were shunned as politically inexpedient by the colonial governors and secretaries of state for the colonies. The poorly planned, forceful and arbitrary relocations in Nogororo in the 1970s and Mkomazi in the 1980s have no parallel in the colonial period. To my knowledge, the colonial government never issued a shoot-on-sight directive for people found inside protected areas (Neumann 2001: 322).

During the formation of the independent African state, a centralised government took control over the natural resources that the British had ostensibly held in trust for the peoples of Tanganyka up until that time under the International Trusteeship agreement. With the state taking ownership of natural resources that are vital to rural livelihoods, the struggle between peasants and the state’s bureaucratic apparatus, its game department, continued unabated. It is in this context that we find a striking example of continuing bureaucratic authoritarianism in relation to the control and administration of natural resources, often to the detriment of the peasant communities.

Today African government officials and wildlife professionals engaged in wildlife-related work in Tanzania are actively involved in perpetuating the global fascination with African wild animals in spite of the neocolonial overtones of such labour (Garland 2006: 26):

Far from being associated with African naturalness or global peripherality, for many Tanzanians, and for the post-socialist Tanzanian state, wild animals have increasingly come to symbolize the
potential of nature to yield capital on a globally-significant scale. They are living embodiments of the natural wealth of the nation, with the capacity to remake individual and collective lives. As caretakers and gatekeepers to such valued – and valuable – national resources, those Tanzanians who work in the field of wildlife conservation occupy a privileged vantage point from which to access the potential of wildlife, and to control the access of others to it (Garland 2006: 31).

Honey’s study, *Ecotourism and Sustainable Development* (1999) reviews tourism in Tanzania in the post-colonial period and asserts that Tanganyika’s colonial conservation policy made the transition virtually unaltered in ideology into postcolonial Tanzania. It was, she says, a transition carefully scripted and controlled by the major international conservation organizations that feared that the end of colonialism would mean the end of wildlife (Honey 1999: 225). The International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (ICUN), founded in Switzerland after the Second World War to encourage environmental conservation on a global scale, devised on the eve of African independence an “African Special Project” which would focus world attention on conservation in Africa. Its purpose was to inform and influence public opinion through targeting African leaders and newly independent governments that conservation was in their best interests. The ICUN delegates felt that “the accelerated rate of destruction of wild fauna, flora and habitat in Africa . . . was the most urgent conservation problem of the present time.” After sending a representative to a number of African countries to elicit support, the ICUN organised the *Symposium on the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources in Modern African States* to be held in Arusha in September 1961, two months before Tanganyika gained formal independence in December of that year (Neumann 1998:140) (Honey 1999: 225).

Governor Richard Turnbull gave an address at the opening session that outlined the twin purpose of the meeting - to develop a tourism industry and to persuade public opinion among Africans in favour of conservation. Conservationists were encouraged “to awaken African public opinion to the economic and cultural value of their unique heritage of wildlife” and to “work with the masses with missionary zeal” (Neumann 1998: 141). Neumann comments that these quotes from the Symposium show that Africans were regarded as possessing some latent capacity for appreciating European concepts of nature preservation that merely needed to be awakened. The assumption appears to be that western values associated with “natural scenery” and “wildlife spectacle” are universal values.

Julius Nyerere, who was at that time Tanganyika’s first prime minister (and who would later become president) addressed the meeting to encourage the role of international conservationists in a speech known as the *Arusha Manifesto*, the essence of which is encapsulated in the lines quoted below. Nyerere, however, did not draft this proclamation. It was Nicholson, the first head of the WWF, and his colleagues who wrote the speech in order to commit Africa’s new rulers to both wildlife protection and continued reliance on European and American expertise” (Honey 1999: 225):
The survival of our wildlife is a matter of grave concern to all of us in Africa. These wild creatures amid the wild places they inhabit are not only important as a source of wonder and inspiration, but are an integral part of our natural resources and our future livelihood and well being.

In accepting the trusteeship of our wildlife we solemnly declare that we will do everything in our power to make sure our children’s grand children will be able to enjoy this rich and precious inheritance.

The conservation of wildlife and wild places calls for specialist knowledge, trained manpower, and money, and we look to other nations to co-operate with us on this important task – the success or failure of which not only affects the continent of Africa but the rest of the world as well. (Honey 1999: 225)

It is explicitly stated here that one of the main reasons why Nyerere endorsed the continuing role of ICUN and WWF in establishing, planning and managing the country’s protected areas was for the purposes of generating foreign exchange through development of the tourism industry (Neumann 1998: 140-141).

It is interesting to note that Jomo Kenyatta made a similar kind of statement in the early months of his role as Prime Minister, saying that “the burden of responsibility for the protection of animals is the responsibility of us all” and that wildlife was a “national asset” requiring protection (Ofcansky 2002: 104).

I am by no means suggesting that the governments of the newly independent states in Africa were motivated by profit over and above a commitment to conservation, but economic considerations no doubt had a major role to play for tourism grew to be among the top foreign currency earners of these countries.

Newly independent Tanzania (as it was called after the 1964 union with Zanzibar) became the focus of international conservation efforts which saw money, technical support and management training going into supporting Tanzania’s national park system (Honey 1999: 225). In addition to the role of European and American organisations, Tanzania’s minute white population, who had overall very limited formal wildlife training, continued to play a disproportionately powerful role in managing the country’s post-independence wildlife services (Honey 1999: 226). In attempts to address this imbalance, the African Wildlife Management Leadership Foundation (now known as the African Wildlife Foundation or AWF) founded the College of African Wildlife Management in Mweka to begin the Africanisation of East Africa’s game department (Ofcansky 2002: 110). This in effect created an elite class of conservation bureaucrats who were trained in western ideologies and practices of natural resource conservation who essentially replicated the top-down and repressive practices inaugurated in the preservation of nature during colonial rule (Honey 1999: 226). This elite group formed part of a bureaucratic management system that formed the mediating link between local conservationist objectives and the promotion of state interests in the form of securing wildlife and wilderness assets that would generate much of the country’s foreign revenue.
Soon after independence Tanzania declared itself a one party state which Nyerere saw as essential to meld diverse cultures into a unified nation. In his 1967 *Arusha Declaration* Nyerere outlined the country’s new policy of “socialism and self-reliance” in which it was declared that Tanzania should not rely on foreign aid or investment and that, under the Leadership Code, political leaders and top civil servants should not be involved in capitalist activities. The foundation of the country’s socialist development rested upon the creation of *Ujaama* villages where agricultural work and social services could be communally shared (Honey 1999: 227-228). Large sectors of the economy were nationalized including the tourist industry which was intended to support health care education and other social programmes. Enormous financial investment went into building the tourist infrastructure between 1969 and 1974 when about $40 million was budgeted for allocation to tourism projects mostly concentrated on the remote Northern Safari Circuit. Here the Tanzania Tourist Corporation (TTC) owned and operated fifteen luxury hotels, where despite Nyerere’s declaration, the tourist industry was heavily dependent on foreign expertise, capital and imports (Honey 1999: 229-230). In comparison with the radically different economic and political strategies of neighbouring Kenya, which had embraced international investment, Tanzania’s tourism was heavily constrained by the country’s extreme poverty, lack of infrastructure and the government’s brand of socialism (Honey 1999: 227).

After Tanzania had made costly capital investments to attract foreign revenue, and tourist numbers had begun to rise, the Tanzanian tourist industry crashed. It fell apart because it depended on Kenya for international visitors that, Tanzanian socialists contended, was a fatal flaw. The essence of the problem was that Kenya had all the tourists but Tanzania had the best tourist attractions (Honey 1999: 231). International visitors flew into Nairobi, historically the safari capital of East Africa, drove to Tanzania’s spectacular northern circuit, which meant that “that tourists crossed the border but the tourist dollars did not” (Honey 1999: 231). This disparity had a role to play in the February 1977 collapse of the economic alliance of the East African Community. Kenya immediately announced it was seizing East African Airways and other communal assets and Nyerere sealed off all air and road links between Kenya and Tanzania in response (Honey 1999: 231). With tourism at a standstill, Tanzania launched an ambitious marketing campaign to sell the country to overseas visitors.

By early 1980s the figures of non-resident visitors to national parks in Tanzania were below 50,000 per annum, compared with the 360,000 tourists to Kenya in the same period, making tourism Kenya’s second highest foreign exchange earner at that time (Honey 1999: 232). The border closure basically signaled the end of state-run tourism in Tanzania and the rebirth of that industry through privatisation. This process commenced in two stages. Beginning in 1977, the first stage saw local capital laying the foundational infrastructure such as roads, hotels, national parks, trained personnel and overseas marketing for the local private sector. The second stage, beginning in the mid-1980s, involved the substantial investment of
foreign capital. It was at this time when Nyerere stepped down and his successor, Ali Hassan Mwini, embraced economic liberalizations and structural adjustment policies by the World Bank and IMF. A 1984 agreement reopened the road and air links between Tanzania and Kenya, although tour operators were barred from plying their trade in the national parks of other countries, which effectively meant that tour groups changed over at the border town of Namanga. By 1992 tourism was Tanzania’s primary foreign exchange earner and by 1993 its tourism sector was the second most rapidly growing in Africa (Honey 1999: 234). The Tanzanian tourist industry continued to grow exponentially with the numbers of tourists rising by 28 percent each year since 1985. The phenomenal growth of tourism in Tanzania thereafter can rightly be regarded as the logical outcome of a long history of expanding nature production.

Neumann and Lissu’s archival-based research on the national parks ideal in Tanzania do not stop at the colonial period. Neumann’s 2001 study shows an interlinked set of historical and political forces grounded in the colonial-era imposition of empty wilderness reserves. He argues that the growth of the tourism industry and the rise of international conservation organizations have had a powerful effect on Tanzania’s policies of wildlife and wilderness conservation after the independence of that country. National parks and protected areas came to be viewed as key components in economic development and a source of foreign exchange. At this time wildlife professionals were engaged in the production of a particular version of African nature that was tied to the discourses and practices of wildlife conservation that in turn were derived from the colonial era. Not only were conservation policies of the colonialist period retained, but they were expanded and expedited in militarised fashion order to facilitate and expand the flow of foreign visitors to the country’s parks. That these national institutions of Tanzania, frequently seen by local peoples as material evidence of the legacy of colonialism, were established in the post-independence era can be attributed to the powerful influence of the global economy. Much capital has been invested and massive amounts of future revenue ride on the Tanzania’s wildlife and wilderness as primary foreign exchange earners. But the government’s reliance on tourist-based revenue has meant ever closer state control over natural resources largely to the detriment communities in and around national parks.

To conclude, Tanzania has become the focus of current debates on sustainable use, biological conservation and institutional management of conservation in Africa (Leader-Williams 2000: 220). The preservationist viewpoint that wild life only has a place in protected areas that are fenced and patrolled by armed rangers has come to be regarded largely as a latter-day legacy of colonialism that has fostered attitudes of resentment if not active resistance from local peoples. Seen from this perspective, acts such as illegal hunting, grazing trespass, and fuel wood theft may be perceived as a form of ‘everyday resistance’ to top-down, coercive policies attending the establishment of game reserves and hunting laws, as Neumann (1995) has argued. Such were actions are not aimed at reforming the legal order, but
‘undoing its application in practice’ as a form of resistance to conservation policies that threaten rural livelihoods (Neumann 1995: 365).

Continuing violations of conservation laws by rural communities are seen by Neumann as an act of protest, but are also no doubt also a question of utilization of available resources in the face of scarcity. Resource use is predominantly geared toward human demand rather than ecological capacity, and as populations increase and individual needs or aspirations grow, the pressure on the natural environment continues to intensify. In this scenario, laws regulating hunting are largely irrelevant to the fate of the fauna (Child and Chitsike 2000: 249). As a consequence, the use of wild meat, animal by-products and live animals for trade have been essential in sustaining rural livelihoods in Tanzania. This is the subject of a controversial study Making a Killing or Making a Living? Wildlife trade, trade controls and rural livelihoods (2002) focused on the documentation of wild life use and its intersection with the international wild life trade in the East Usambara Mountains of Tanzania. In this study Roe et al argue that illegal hunting for wild meat is not confined to this region alone, but is widespread throughout the country. They contend that wild meat consumption accounts for well over one third of all forms of wild life utilization including tourism. Their argument is supported by statistics supplied by the IUCN:

In the late 1980s, a study conducted by IUCN - the World Conservation Union and the International Trade Centre (1989) suggested that the gross value of wildlife (other than timber and fisheries) to the Tanzanian economy was US$128.50 million per year. Illegal wildlife hunting for wild meat comprised some US$50 million annually, followed by non-consumptive tourism, tourist hunting and other forms of consumptive utilisation. More recent research conducted in Tanzania suggests well over two-thirds of people eat wild meat, with up to 95 per cent of the rural population claiming it is their most important meat protein source (Roe et al 2002: 56).

In addition, figures from the IUCN study show that there is a substantial trade in trophies and skins, while live specimens make up the majority of animal exports:

During the period 1989 to 1999 at least 1.68 million birds, 521 000 reptiles, 148 000 amphibians and 12 000 mammals were exported from Tanzania (Milledge in prep.). Bird exports peaked in 1994, whilst amphibian and reptile exports have not dropped significantly since 1995. Many animal exports are CITES-listed species including, during the period 1990 to 2000, nearly 600 000 live birds, reptiles, mammals and invertebrates and over 16 000 trophies and skins, according to CITES trade data (Roe et al 2002: 56).

Illegal hunting and other forms of wild life use have been identified as the main cause of diminishing numbers of game today, as these high statistics appear to bear out. Many of these animals, birds and reptiles are taken from areas of abundance which, in a climate of burgeoning population growth and dwindling habitat, are generally located in or around reserves. Leader-Williams cites the estimated figures for illegal hunting in the Selous Game Reserve area alone at between 150,000 and 200,000 animals per annum. This he compares to legal hunting statistics for the 1992/1993 season in Tanzania, of which
resident hunting accounted for a total of 5,285 animals at a value of US$40,000 in game fees, and tourist hunting for 7,034 animals at a value of US$3.6million in game fees (Leader-Williams 2000: 236-237). He concludes that tourist hunting is the most lucrative, low-impact form of land use that has the added benefit of rehabilitating the natural habitat or restoring farmland to its former richness and diversity.

In light of the present situation where conservationists are confronted with ever-decreasing numbers of wild life both within and outside of reserves attributed largely on illegal off-take, Prins & Grootenhuis et al see tourist hunting, with its low off-take of high-value game species and its excellent potential for profitability, as the best means for ensuring the survival wild life in the future. They conclude that wildlife use in the form of hunting is not only beneficial to conservation, but will allow endemic habitats to remain in place for the long term survival of the fauna of these areas. They assert that the places in Africa where wildlife is increasing are where there is private ownership of wildlife (as in South Africa) – but where there is no practical ownership of wildlife, (as is the case in East Africa), wild animal populations are declining (Prins & Grootenhuis 2000: 480). This decline is attributed to ever-increasing populations that are becoming increasingly impoverished, and because they are barely able to sustain themselves they must revert to hunting as a survival strategy (ibid).

The purpose of this chapter is to demonstrate the extent to which wilderness areas in East Africa have become among the most highly valued and bitterly contested landscapes in the world. To this end I have attempted to present an overview of the issues to be found in and around national parks and reserves. It appears that nature-rich African states such as Tanzania have taken on the cause of conserving wilderness spaces and wild animals because this is a highly economically productive mode of land use. It generates foreign interest, financial aid and tourist revenue as well as national and personal prestige for Tanzania (Garland 2006: 62). What is clear is that national parks and reserves are among the most important contexts in which local populations experience state power. The most impoverished level of society, the rural peasantry, bear the brunt of a type of state oppression that is directed towards meeting the goals of the capitalist projects of the Tanzanian state, international conservation organizations and the global tourism industry.
CONCLUSION

The national parks and reserves of Tanzania can be seen as the physical manifestation of a particular landscape phenomenon reflecting what Mitchell has called the ‘dreamwork’ of imperialism (Mitchell 1994: 10). I have argued that a landscape tradition derived from the Europe and America allowed African wilderness to be seized upon as an expression of this imperialist vision that was realized in the form of the national park or reserve. These contentions are supported in large measure by those writing about the history of conservation in that country such as Garland (2006) and Neumann (1998), who assert that the vision of nature that underpins the phenomenon of African conservation are reliant upon power relations that are fundamentally linked to imperialism. ⁹

Imperialism describes an economic relation, and it is in this sense that I deploy the term. In the history of the British Empire Pax Britannica refers to a period of British expansionism after the Battle of Waterloo which culminated in the ‘scramble’ of annexations in Africa during the 1880s and 1890s. This was a time of sudden and massive land gain that has been explained by economic theorists as a response to the Great Depression in industry and trade of the 1870s and 1880s that had formed a pan-European ‘glut’ of domestic capitalism. As an antidote to the diminishing returns of domestic investment, imperialism opened up a vast new field for commercial endeavor that brought windfall gains to those who were able to market in raw materials (Samuel 1998: 87). For Europe the 1890s was a period of rapid industrial expansion, growing class struggles and rising commodity prices of the ‘second industrial revolution’ emerging out of the Great Depression of that era, all of which shaped the violent conquest of Africa and the drive to control African labour and production.

In America the taming of nature took place over five centuries since its ‘discovery’ in 1492; in East Africa the same transformation took place over an extremely condensed period of time. Early British exploratory journeys into East Africa began with the expedition of Burton and Speke (1857-1859), followed by Speke and Grant (1861 – 1863) and the (1866 -1873) journey of Livingstone whom Stanley (1871) was sent to find. But strictly speaking the transformation of East Africa can be said to have begun after the Berlin

⁹ I understand colonialism to be a phase in the history of imperialism during which the colonial state became the agent for metropolitan capital interests (Howe 1993:9).
Treaty of 1885, from which point the Imperial British East Africa Company (IBEAC) had been established to foster trade with Kenya until administration was transferred to the Foreign Office on 1 July 1895 (which by 1896 would also include Uganda). The colonial occupation and transformation of East Africa effectively took place with great violence within eight decades between the Berlin treaty and independence in the early 1960s, after which ‘development’ would continue apace. In this short period, roughly 1880 to 1960, the distinctive structures and practices of the colonial state were established. This included white settlement and the establishment of infrastructure and industry, and, most importantly, the penetration of capitalism into indigenous society.

According to Berman, the basic structures of colonialism were erected in the quarter-century before the First World War and consolidated in the inter-war decades with little significant modification until the post-1945 period (Berman 1992: 145 -146). Up until then the capital investment in trading economy was extremely limited, but thereafter East Africa saw a burst of intensified capitalist development inaugurated by the implementation of the Colonial Development Welfare Act of 1940 which provided imperial finance for long term development plans. This era saw an invigorated form of 'articulation' comprising both the widespread domination of African society by capitalist forces, and renewed coercion by that state to conform to the ideals of development (Berman 1992: 144). British Conservative and Labour parties committed large sums of capital investment to the idea of guiding colonial peoples along the road to self-government. This took the form of "developmental planning and secondary industry, cash-crop expansion and agricultural improvement schemes, educational advance, constitutional progress and local government reform"; in short, a massive period of change occurred in the late period of colonization during which nature became domesticated, tamed and transformed (Iliffe 1979: 436).

Colonial independence has been of historical and political importance, but also of great symbolic significance. It has been seen as a cumulative moment of a process of dynamic synthesis that had gathered momentum from the period prior. Theorists like JanMohamed have seen the period leading up to independence in Gramscian terms as a 'hegemonic' phase, in which an internalization of Western culture led indigenous peoples to accept the values and institutions of the colonizer. This was a process reliant on 'consent' in which the moment of independence can be seen as a ritualized acceptance of
westernized forms of parliamentary government (JanMohamed 1985: 62). Decolonisation formed a kind of metaphysical frontier in the African transition to modernity around which African peoples negotiated the politically productive discontinuities of hybridity. It was a time of resistance and assimilation in which new cultural identities and even new traditions were forged, as Anderson (1991) and Ranger (1993) have argued. Many structures instituted during colonialism survived the independence of the African states, and the conservation industry in Tanzania is one such example.

As described in the chapter ‘The Contested Landscape’, conservationist policy featured strongly in national affairs in the transition from colonial to postcolonial rule. With decolonization, as both Garland and Honey have argued, the structures of conservation in Tanzania provided the British with a way to continue a mode of authority within wildlife bureaucracies. This was done by handing over nominal control to Africans in the field of wildlife management, all the while retaining effective authority as technical advisors and mentors. As a result colonial game officers were able to perpetuate their privileged positions in relation to Tanzanian nature and people for nearly a decade after Tanzanian independence (Garland 2006: 320). After the 1977 collapse of the economic alliance of the East African Community and the subsequent shift away from socialism, conservation was endorsed as a means whereby the nation could produce value from nature in the form of foreign aid and tourism revenue. From then onwards, nature-based enterprises began to be more accessible to private citizens and investors, and Tanzania began to actively produce wilderness and wildlife value in conjunction with the capitalist private sector.

The conservationist aims of this country - to protect wild animals and wilderness landscapes - have become key to attracting the international tourist trade and are therefore tied the workings of the free market. In tandem with this development, the Tanzanian state wildlife bureaucracy became the principle agency of this capitalist project, and comprised the immediate context in which the state was able to assert authority over people and landscapes. Garland has observed similarities between the processes of decolonization and the privatization of the Tanzanian wildlife sector that suggest a fundamental relationship between colonialism and neoliberal capitalism:

This relationship inheres, I believe, in the purported naturalness of the market itself, for the market under neoliberalism is taken to be neutral and extra-social in much the same way that nature is

---

10 It is interesting to note how the terms pre-colonial, colonial and post-colonial mark a series of historicist stages in Africa’s development and tend to parallel those used to describe the devolvement of global capitalism: pre-industrial, developing, developed.
framed within colonial conservationist ideology. In both cases . . . this labor is effaced, rendered invisible by the conceit that the market and nature are natural. As I have argued, the vision of nature that underpins the phenomenon of African wildlife conservation relies upon and generates power relations that are fundamentally colonial in nature. Likewise, the idea that the free market is natural is also highly productive of structural inequalities – many of the same ones, of race and class, that are generated by conservationist ideology. In their mutual appeal to nature, colonial power and the forces of neoliberal capital converge. From the perspective of the contemporary Tanzanian state, conserving wildlife offers the promise of access to both (Garland 2006: 322-323).

I have argued that this country, with its spectacular geographical formations and plains of game, has been understood primarily as a repository of nature within the global community. It is a conception that is historically embedded in the sense that the colony of Tanganyika lacked infrastructure compared to the other East African states of the British Empire prior to independence, allowing for vast areas of this country to be cast as conservation areas. However, since independence in 1961 Tanzania had continued the program of preserving wilderness spaces that had been inaugurated during the colonial period. Land was allocated either specifically for development and habitation, or set aside as wilderness in the form of national park and reserves, where limited settlement, if any, was allowed. In following this policy, Tanzania has perpetuated a particular ideology of nature premised upon an earlier landscape tradition that privileged the ‘empty’ landscape of pristine wilderness – in effect reproducing the ‘vision of wild Africa’ from which ‘tourist value’ is generated.

A vision of wild Africa was imposed upon Africa during the colonial era that lives on in various ways, as can be seen in the example of Tanzania, which today still occupies a position within the global symbolic economy as a space of nature. For many Tanzanians, however, the conceptualization of that country as a repository of nature within the world order does not express African naturalness or global peripherality, but indicates rather a widespread understanding that wild animals and wilderness spaces offer the potential of nature to yield capital on a globally-significant scale (Garland 2006: 31). So, by actively promoting the idea that it is a ‘state of nature’, Tanzania is able to trade upon the enduring Western fascination for remote ecosystems and nostalgia for unspoiled wilderness.
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